DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 987 RC 006 194

TITLE	Small Community Needs: A Study of Small Community Needs as Related to Federal Housing and Community Development Assistance.
INSTITUTION	Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	162p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Development; *Community Problems; Community Services; *Community Size; Federal Programs; Housing; *Methodology; Population Trends; Research; *Rural Areas; Rural Development; Rural Environment; Social Factors

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and other specified Federal agencies regarding their responsiveness to the problems and needs of small communities. A major objective was to define a "small" community and to determine how its problems and needs differ from those of a large community. (Each of the 36 communities included in the study had a population of 50,000 or less.) A methodology was established through which the study team could identify and analyze the needs and problems of small communities in a context which is meaningful for an evaluation of Federal program assistance. A small community profile (SCP), appendix A, was designed to provide information on the governmental, economic, physical, and social characteristics of the community and to serve as a methodology whereby such information could be obtained and analyzed concurrently and subsequently by professional staff having familiarity with Federal programs. The SCP and the community study methodology covered 3 types of information: (1) information and data in the "real" characteristics of the community; (2) information on community capabilities; and (3) information on problems as perceived by the community. Twenty-three recommendations for strengthening community programs were put forth, and the SCP and study methodology were recommended for use in the analysis of other communities. (LS)

ED 063987

92d Congress
1st Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

RC
I-Cont'd

SMALL COMMUNITY NEEDS

RECEIVED
MAY 11 1972
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

A STUDY OF SMALL COMMUNITY NEEDS AS RELATED TO FEDERAL HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

VOLUME 1, JUNE 1970

PREPARED FOR:

THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Contract H–1074)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NOVEMBER 30, 1971

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1971

SE 70-132

ERC006194

S

ED 068201

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia, *Chairman*

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana
JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi
B. EVERETT JORDAN, North Carolina
GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota
JAMES B. ALLEN, Alabama
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
LAWTON CHILES, Florida
JACK MILLER, Iowa
GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont
MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota
CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma

HARKER T. STANTON, *General Counsel and Staff Director*
MICHAEL R. MCLEOD, *Counsel*
HENRY J. CASSO, *Economist*
JAMES W. GILTMIER, *Press Secretary*
JAMES E. THORNTON, *Consultant—Rural Development*
JOHN A. BAKER, *Consultant—Rural Development*
JERRY D. LANDRETH, *Research Director—Rural Development*
COTYS M. MOUSER, *Chief Clerk*
JAMES M. KENDALL, *Clerk for the Minority*
BETTY M. MASON, *Clerical Assistant*
BLANCHE M. O'BERG, *Clerical Assistant*
HELEN A. MILLER, *Clerical Assistant*
LOUELLA C. MCENROE, *Clerical Assistant*
DIXIE LEE TALLEY, *Clerical Assistant—Rural Development*
NANCY C. BENSON, *Clerical Assistant—Rural Development*
BESSIE E. HARRIS, *Clerical Assistant—Rural Development*

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C., November 29, 1971.

Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In June of 1970 the Department of Housing and Urban Development contracted with the Jacobs Company, Inc. of Chicago, Illinois, to conduct a study concerning the needs of small communities as they related to Federal assistance programs. Although this study was financed with public funds, the findings and results of the study have never been made available to the public or to other branches or agencies of the Federal Government who have a direct interest in the subject. An analysis of this study by our Rural Development Subcommittee staff reveals that the study's findings would be of significant value to Members of the Committee and the Senate. Therefore, I respectfully request that Volume I of the study, entitled, "A Study of Small Community Needs As Related to Federal Housing and Community Development Assistance," be printed as a Committee Print.

The purposes of this study are (1) to identify small community problems and needs, (2) to determine the extent to which the delivery of HUD and other Federal program assistance is meeting these needs, and (3) to make recommendations for improvements in the delivery system, where needed. The study was based upon an in-depth field survey and analysis of 36 small communities which were selected as representative of all areas of the country.

The study consists of two volumes. The first volume, which follows, contains the study's design, methodology, analysis, conclusions and recommendations. The second volume, which is on file with the Subcommittee, contains the completed comprehensive profiles of the 36 communities visited and studied. In addition to this general study of small community needs, a companion study covering "minority group needs in small communities" was prepared by Roy Littlejohn Associates.

The focus of the Littlejohn study was on minority group perceptions of small community needs and problems, whereas the general study conducted by the Jacobs Company concentrated on an analysis of these needs and problems as perceived by community leaders. Although the Littlejohn study is not included in this report, it is on file with the Subcommittee and it will be made available for review to any interested Member of the Committee or the Senate upon request.

I believe Volume I of this general study of small community needs will be of particular value to the Rural Development Subcommittee in its efforts to develop policies and programs to revitalize the economic and social services of our Nations smaller communities which make up Rural America.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Rural Development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of the Study	1
Introduction	10
Scope of Study	11
Outline of Study	12
I. Methodology and Selection of Communities	13
Preliminary Analysis	13
Selection of Communities	16
Field Plan and On-Site Survey	20
II. Small Community Profile	21
Design of the Small Community Profile	22
Description of the Small Community Profile	25
Governmental Sector	25
Economic Sector	26
Physical Sector	27
Social Sector	28
III. Definition and Classification of Small Communities	28
Definition of Small Communities	28
Classification of Small Communities	30
Classification by Factor Analysis	30
Description of Factor Characteristics	31
A Classification Model for Small Communities	44
IV. Small Community Needs and Problems	45
Major Small Community Sector Needs	46
Government Sector	47
Economic Sector	50
Physical Sector	51
Social Sector	54
Small Community Perceptions—Community Leadership Versus Minority Views	56
Small Community Leadership and Involvement	60
The Small Community and Intergovernmental Relations	62
Small Community Needs for Outside Assistance	63
Use of Federal Programs by Small Communities	64
Community Experiences in the Use of Federal Programs	65
V. Federal Assistance to Small Communities	67
Programs Available to Small Communities	68
Planning Assistance Programs	68
Technical Assistance Programs	71
Physical Development Programs	71
Evaluation of Federal Programs	77
Recommendations for Modification of Existing Programs	77
Comprehensive Planning Assistance Program	78
Workable Program for Community Improvement	82
Technical Assistance Programs	84
Housing Programs	85
Water, Sewer and Waste Treatment Programs	87
Recommendations for New Programs	89
Small Community Development Programs	89
Public Facilities Program	91
Administration of Federal Programs	91
Small Town Services Program	91
Reorganization of HUD Field Organization	95
Program Application Reviews	96

State Assistance to Small Communities 96
State Offices of Community Affairs 96
State Financial and Technical Assistance 96
Special State Assistance Programs 98
Expansion of State Role in Assisting Small Communities 99
State Encouragement of Small Community Consolidation 100
The Growth of Regional Agencies 102
Economic Development Districts 102
Appalachian Regional Commission 103
Regional Planning Agencies 103
Non-Metropolitan Planning Districts 103
Coordination of Regional Agencies 104
Appendices
Appendix A. Small Community Profile 107
Appendix B. Community Profiles ..... (Bound Separately)
Appendix C. Bibliography 154

Summary of the Study

This section presents a summary of the study of small community needs and problems and of ways to improve the delivery of Federal programs to better meet such needs. Conclusions and recommendations of the study, together with related descriptive material and analyses, are presented in detail in the subsequent sections and appendices of the report.

Significant conclusions have been reached and recommendations developed with respect to each phase of the study. These conclusions and recommendations accordingly relate to:

(1) The Small Community Profile
(2) Definition and Classification of Small Communities
(3) Small Community Needs and Problems
(4) Federal Assistance to Small Communities.

SMALL COMMUNITY PROFILE

As an essential starting point for the study, it was necessary to establish a means and methodology through which the study team could identify and analyze the needs and problems of small communities in a context which is meaningful for an evaluation of Federal program assistance. This was done through (a) The design of a small community profile (SCP) which identifies the information to be obtained on the governmental, economic, physical and social characteristics of the community and (b) The development of a methodology whereby such information was obtained and was analyzed concurrently and subsequently by professional staff who also had familiarity with Federal programs. In this manner, the total relationship between small community needs and Federal programs could be analyzed, and the "delivery system" by which Federal, especially HUD, program assistance is furnished could be evaluated.

The SCP and the community study methodology covered three distinct types of information. (1) information and data in the "real" characteristics of the community; (2) information on community capabilities; and (3) information on problems as perceived by the community. By thus combining the "real' or factual characteristics of the community with the subjective perception and judgment of persons in the community and of the staff analysts, the SCP becomes an effective research tool for community analysis and evaluation. It is recommended that the small community profile and study methodology developed in this study be utilized further in the analysis of other communities.

DEFINITION AND CLASSIFICATION OF SMALL COMMUNITIES

One objective in this study of small community needs and Federal program assistance was to develop a definition and classification of small communities or a system for such definition and classification. There are many possible definitions and classifications of small communities, any one or combination of which may be used, depending largely on the purpose to be served.

In the context and focus of this study, an appropriate definition should reflect characteristics which are meaningful in terms of providing outside assistance to the community. The classification of small communities should reflect a means to evaluate the small community environment in terms of community characteristics and their relationships as they affect the needs for and success of the delivery of HUD program assistance to these communities.

Because of these complexities, the conclusion must be drawn that there is no one universal definition of a small community which can be applied to all aspects of the delivery system of HUD program assistance. Since the study deals with "small" community needs, the factor or definition by size is pervading, but here too purposes have been identified for which the small community should be defined as under 25,000 population and other cases where under 15,000 population is the appropriate definition.

Several different definitions are accordingly used and proposed as a result of this study, including definitions by size, by location, and by economic viability. These definitions are designed as appropriate for the particular requirements of the delivery of Federal program assistance to small communities.

Meaningful classifications of small communities must consider a number of factors which are related but tend not to be consistent throughout all relevant functional areas. Accordingly, a classification system has been developed and applied for the study of small communities through which the inter-relationships between important community indicators and major functional areas of concern can be systematically stated.

The community classification system is basically a factor analysis of the key community characteristics which are capable of explaining the major inter-relationships within a community environment. The basis and methodology of this study enabled the study team to use both statistical data and the judgmental conclusions of persons in the community and of qualified professional analysts. This combination produces a meaningful indepth analysis and basis for community classification. It was applied in this study to a small but broadly representative sample of 36 communities, but could effectively be applied to a larger sample and produce more validly projectable information.

The community classification system and factor analysis involves the recording and comparison of statistical data and subjective ratings of 38 community characteristics. These characteristics are:

Form of government
Government organization and services
Fiscal effort
Fiscal capacity
Planning
Population size
Percent of population growth
Percent minority population
Percent elderly population
Percent population under 18
Median age
Location
Economic classification
Industrial concentration
Industry and commerce
Employment
Banking
Transportation
Total economy
Growth center
Median family income
Family income under $3,000
Sound housing
Housing built before 1939
Value of housing
Housing needs
Housing effort
Physical development
Community facilities
Education
School years completed
Health
Recreation
Community leadership and citizen involvement
Age of community
Community needs
Needs for outside assistance
Federal program use

Having defined and ranked these key community characteristics for the communities that were studied, a classification model was developed which reflects the environments in these communities and furnishes a basis for small community analysis. This model is shown on the following page, reflecting the relationships of the key community characteristics with the principal elements of the small community profile. These elements are considered to reflect conditions that would be optimal from the community's viewpoint and from the perspective of HUD in considering program assistance to a community.

Analysis of the results of the basic classification system and study methodology, and of the key relationships identified in the classification model, provides the basis for conclusions on small community needs and problems and recommendations on Federal assistance to small communities. The model accordingly provides a meaningful evaluation of the small community environment and reflects the many relationships of community characteristics which impact on the delivery of HUD program assistance of these communities.

SMALL COMMUNITY NEEDS AND PROBLEMS

One major objective of the study has been to identify the governmental, economic, physical, and social needs of small communities in order to establish bases for recommendations for adopting or developing HUD and other Federal programs to effectively meet such needs.

By way of introductory comment, it must of course be understood that the small community needs identified in this study reflect the

A CLASSIFICATION MATRIX MODEL FOR SMALL COMMUNITIES

CHARACTERISTICS	Good Organization & Services	Good Fiscal Effort	High Fiscal Capacity	Good Planning	Good Industry & Commerce	Good Employment	Good Transportation	Low Housing Needs	High Housing Effort	Good Physical Development	Good Community Facilities	Good Education System	Good Recreation Facilities	Good Health Facilities	Good Community Leadership and Citizen Involvement
Form of Government	C-M			C-M						C-M	C-M	C-M		C-M	C-M
Government Organization & Service		(+)		(+)	+	±		±	±	(+)	(+)	+	+	+	(+)
Fiscal Effort	(+)		(-)							(+)		(+)	(+)	(+)	
Fiscal Capacity		(-)			+						+				
Planning	(+)				(+)	+	+		(+)	(+)	(+)	+	(+)	+	(+)
Population Size	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	+		-	(+)	(+)	(+)		(+)	(+)	+
Percent Population Growth			(+)	+				(+)							(+)
Percent Minority Population								(-)	+						
Percent Elderly Population								(-)		-					(-)
Percent Population Under 18												+			
Median Age	-			-	+					-	-	-			(-)
Location				METRO			METRO				METRO				
Total Economic Rating	(+)	+	(+)	(+)	+	+	+	+	+	(+)	(+)	(+)		(+)	+
Growth Center					+	+					(+)		+	+	(+)
Medium Family Income		(+)				(+)		(+)		(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	
Family Income Under $3,000		(-)		(-)		(-)		(-)		(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	
Sound Housing	(+)	+	(-)					(+)		(+)		+			
Housing Built Before '39	-		-	-				(-)	+	(-)	(-)			-	
Value of Housing	(+)	(+)						(+)	+	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	+
Housing Needs										-					
Housing Effort				(+)						(+)					(+)
Physical Development		(+)	+	(+)		+		(+)	(+)		(+)	+	(+)	+	(+)
Community Facilities					(+)	+									(+)
Public Education System	+				+	(+)	+			+	+		+	+	(+)
School Years Completed	(+)	+				(+)		+		+		(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
Health	+						+			+	+	+	+		
Recreation & Culture	(+)		-		(+)					+	(+)			+	(+)
Community Leadership and Involvement	(+)			(+)		+	+		(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	+	
Age of Community				(-)	+		-	(-)							-
Major Needs	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Needs for Outside Assistance	-		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	
Federal Program Use	+		+	+			-	+	+	+			+	+	+

Metro = SMSA or Satellite City
\+ = Positive relationship
\- = Negative relationship
( ) = Key relationship
= Cells without observations indicate no significant relationship

condition of a small and biased sample of communities. However, these needs and problems do fit into a pattern of requirements which has been identified in other work by The Jacobs Company and by others.

It should also be recognized that the identification of small community needs and problems does not automatically lead to a requirement for Federal assistance, since other elements such as economic viability of the community, community leadership and involvement, community effort, and other factors will impact on the applicability and utility of Federal assistance. These conditions are reflected in subsequent

recommendations on Federal program assistance which give considerable stress to improving planning processes and reflecting the character of community study techniques which have been applied in this study.

The following summary identifies needs and conditions of small communities with respect to the several community characteristics as analyzed during this study—covering the governmental, economic, physical and social sectors. Other significant findings of need deal with comparison of the perception of problems by the community leadership and minority groups, the effectiveness of citizen leadership and involvement, and the needs for and utilization of outside assistance.

With respect to the governmental sector, a number of significant needs reflected themselves. Both the direct study of adequacy of public services and the factor analysis of public services with other community characteristics indicated a need for professional city administration as an essential ingredient for small community development. With respect to the adequacy of municipal services, most numerous needs were evidenced for strengthening code enforcement inspection and supervised recreation programs. Other major needs in the public service sector, clearly most heavily concentrated in communities under 5,000 population, dealt with required improvements in fire, police, street maintenance, garbage collection, and library services. In many of the communities, there was evident need to improve fiscal capacity by means primarily of reducing or eliminating limitations on local financing for local services. It was equally evident in many of the communities that there is a need for the smaller communities to make a greater effort to more fully utilize available revenue sources of a non-property tax nature. While most of the communities studied had available comprehensive plans prepared for the development of the communities, there is definite need for strengthening the planning process and for scheduled implementation of the approved plans. These circumstances reflected serious weaknesses in the small communities in terms of financial and technical staff capabilities.

With respect to the economic sector of community characteristics, major needs were identified for the communities to more realistically review their industrial development potential; for there to be significant increase in the provision of vocational training, on-the-job training and adult education programs; for greater risk capital to be made available for business and funds to support the housing market; and for improvements to be made in intracity transportation services and facilities.

The analysis of physical characteristics of small communities reflected significant needs to renovate or modernize the city's central business district; to provide for more adequate housing with heaviest emphasis on needs for improving low income housing; to correct the inadequacies of public community facilities such as reflected by needs for new city halls, more adequate police facilities, correcting major deficiencies of street systems, improvements in refuse disposal facilities, and needs for more adequate sewage treatment plants, and storm sewer systems.

The major needs for improvements in the social sector of community characteristics showed themselves proportionately greatest in the

smaller communities within the group that was studied, significantly those communities having less than 15,000 population. These reflected needs for improvements in health and medical services, and recreation and cultural programs. While needs were identified with respect to the public school system in many of the smaller communities, it was also significant to note that major inadequacies were evident in only a small number of the communities studied.

During the course of the study and analysis of community needs, a comparison was made of the perception of needs in selected communities as indicated by the community leadership and the minority community in these cities.[1] In summary, the perception of major problems and needs in these communities was shared by the community leadership and the minority population particularly with regard to needs for jobs and housing. The perceptions of the two groups, however, varied more widely in terms of priorities and significance of need with respect to other factors in the fields of health and social needs, education, banking resources and availability, public transportation, and political representation.

During the course of the study, considerable emphasis was placed on analysis of community leadership and involvement as important indicators in assessing the progress of the community in dealing with vital local issues and needs. It was a significant conclusion that the leadership and community involvement overall in these small communities was generally low, and that significant stimulation of such leadership and community involvement is a significant need among these communities.

Along with analysis of the communities themselves, the study also appraised the extent of and needs for inter-governmental arrangements or agreements between the communities and other governmental agencies at the county and state levels. It is significant to note that among these small communities there were generally very few examples of the sharing or joint use of governmental services and facilities or of the providing of technical assistance to the communities from other levels of government. While considerable action is being initiated in many states to fill these gaps, a significant need persists to improve intergovernment arrangements and assistances.

As implied in the identification of needs and problems outlined above, it can be summarized that there does exist a significant need among the small communities for financial and technical assistance from outside sources. The analysis of the small communities included in this study stressed that such need is most evident in the smaller communities, those having populations less than 15,000.

In concluding the small community analysis, the use of Federal programs was measured, and the communities were ranked into three groups. Ten communities were assigned to a low rating, with an average of approximately one program per community and $15.00 per capita. Eleven communities were assigned a medium rating, averaging approximately four programs per community and $160.00 per capita. Fifteen communities were assigned a high rating, and averaged approximately seven programs and $500.00 per capita per community.

---

[1] A separate substudy on the needs and problems of minority groups in small communities is contained in a companion report by Roy Littlejohn Associates.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO SMALL COMMUNITIES

Section V of this report presents a summary of Federal program assistance to small communities and a discussion and presentation of 25 specific recommendations for strengthening HUD and related program assistance to small communities. These recommendations constitute an actionable program that will be of distinct benefit to the small communities and that will improve the delivery and service of the HUD programs.

These recommendations concentrate (a) on strengthening community planning processes, (b) on revising requirements for the workable program and related thereto, on distinguishing requirements for a codes improvement program, (c) on increasing funding and program services for training and technical assistance, (d) on building upon existing small communities for new community development through a proposed small community development program, and (e) on strengthening the roles of state and regional government agencies.

The specific recommendations follow:

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Comprehensive Planning Assistance Program

1. The community planning process should be reoriented and divided into two distinct parts: (a) preparation of a preliminary plan which would include an overall analysis of the community, formulation of long-range objectives and goals, establishment of priorities and preparation of a work program to carry them out; and (b) detailed studies of major subject areas identified during the preliminary plan and included in the work program.

2. The preparation and adoption of a preliminary plan should be a prerequisite for all HUD public housing and community development programs.

3. Requirements should be formulated by HUD to require that applicants for "701" funding submit evidence that responsibility for implementation of the plan has been assigned to a specific individual on the city staff and professional assistance in implementing the plan will be available from either the city staff, county, regional or state planning agenceis, or a private consulting firm.

4. Activities eligible for funding under the Comprehensive Planning Assistance program should be expanded to provide specifically for continuing professional planning assistance in administering local plans.

5. The preparation of area-wide rather than individual community comprehensive plans should be encouraged for small, non-metropolitan communities (generally under 25,000 with emphasis under 15,000 in population).

The Workable Program For Community Improvement

6. The requirement for a workable program for community improvement as presently constituted should be discontinued. However, the adoption of codes and establishment of an effective codes enforcement program should continue to be required prior to the acceptance of an application for urban renewal programs.

7. A "Codes Improvement Program" specifically designed for communities of 25,000 and under should be created to assist cities of this size in the adoption and updating of codes, and in the establishment of a codes enforcement program. The program should be administered by the states. Technical assistance should be available to aid communities in code preparation and the training of inspectors. Financial assistance should be provided by states to finance the cost of hiring inspectors to implement the codes enforcement program.

Technical Assistance to Small Communities

8. Technical Assistance and Community Development Training programs should be substantially increased and used primarily to assist communities of 25,000 population or less.

Housing Programs

9. HUD should conduct a study of the present methods for attracting developers and financing for subsidized housing programs to determine whether other mechanisms would be more effective in increasing the use of these programs in small communities.

Water, Sewer and Waste Treatment Programs

10. The Water and Sewer Facilities Grant and Loan Consolidation Act of 1969 providing for HUD responsibility for administering grants and loans for basic water and sewer facilities and Interior responsibility for all waste treatment works should be enacted by Congress. The Economic Development Administration and the Appalachian Regional Commission should retain authority to make supplemental grants.

New Communities Program

11. HUD should encourage the development of new communities in non-metropolitan areas. Such communities preferably should be constructed around existing seed communities with growth potential. Federal and state officials should identify potential seed communities through study techniques similar to those used in this study.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW PROGRAMS

Small Community Development Program

12. A Small Community Development Program should be established as a demonstration program for non-metropolitan communities of 15,000 population and under which would provide grants of up to 100 percent to finance needed community development projects and programs. Eligibility in the program would be limited to those communities with future growth potential that could show limited local resources to finance the programs on their own.

Public Facilities Program

13. HUD should establish a program designed to provide grants of 50 percent to communities under 15,000 population for the construction of administrative and public safety facilities. Supplemental assistance up to an additional 30 percent should also be allowed in cases where more than one of the local governments in a community join together to construct a common facility.

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Small Town Services Program

14. The functions and responsibilities of the Small Town Services program should continue to involve the four major program areas: (a) informational assistance; (b) general assistance and advice; (c) interagency coordination; and (d) research.

15. The Small Town Services program should be augmented in order to be more effective in assisting small communities. Consideration should be given to the establishment of the program function at the regional level.

16. The Small Town Services program should take a lead responsibility in urging the development of a small community data system based upon the small community profile methodology designed for this study.

17. The Small Town Services program should concentrate its efforts on communities of 25,000 population or less.

Program Application Reviews

18. HUD field offices should be instructed to conduct pre-application conferences with communities, especially for major projects such as housing, urban renewal and water and sewer, prior to submittal of formal applications for funding. Conferences should be held in the applicant community and not at the HUD field office.

STATE ASSISTANCE TO SMALL COMMUNITIES

Expansion of State Role in Assisting Small Communities

19. The Federal Government should continue to encourage the establishment of Offices of Community Affairs in states which do not have them.

20. The Federal Government should encourage states to assume greater financial responsibilities for assisting small communities in such areas as technical and planning assistance, housing, urban renewal and other programs aimed at rebuilding and revitalizing small communities.

State Encouragement of Small Community Consolidation

21. The Federal Government should urge states to strongly discourage the further proliferation of municipalities and provide financial and other incentives to encourage either municipal consolidations or the transfer of area-wide functions to regional agencies.

THE GROWTH OF REGIONAL AGENCIES

22. HUD should recommend to the bureau of the Budget that it should actively encourage state governments to implement provisions of the Budget Bureau directives providing for common or consistent planning and development districts at the regional level. If conformance is not forthcoming within a reasonable amount of time, other means should be considered to produce compliance.

23. HUD should urge the states to delegate responsibility for providing better coordination and the common use of resources where

feasible in each regional planning and development district to one of the local participating agencies. The non-metropolitan planning district or COG should be considered for assumption of this role. Ultimate responsibility for coordination however should remain with the states.

A Study of Small Community Needs as Related to Federal Housing and Community Development Assistance [1]

Introduction

In response to the increasingly obvious need to take greater initiative in recognizing and solving small community problems the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), in October, 1968 created the office of Small Town Services. At that time it was recognized that "before HUD can evaluate and adjust its programs and policies to serve better the needs and interests of small communities, it must undertake a comprehensive program of identification and analysis of the small community environment, its special needs, interests and problems." [2] The purpose of the study presented in this report is to evaluate the programs of HUD and certain other Federal agencies, regarding their responsiveness to the problems and needs of small communities. The study is designed to enable HUD to evaluate and improve its organization and program capabilities as related to small communities. The research effort undertaken to achieve this goal has resulted in recommendations to modify Federal Programs to more effectively and/or efficiently improve the quality of small community life. More specifically, the following objectives were set forth as study goals:

(1) the identification of small community problems and needs
(2) an evaluation of the extent to which HUD and other Federal programs are meeting small community needs, and
(3) the formulation of recommendations to improve Federal programs and their "delivery system" to better meet small community needs.

Inherent in each of the above three stated objectives are issues dealing with the approach of the study which had to be resolved in its initial stage. The major research question to be pursued is what is a "small" community and how do its problems differ from those of large communities. Addressing the issue in this way tends to result in frustrating and unsatisfactory conclusions since the factor of size, which is assumed to be of singular importance whenever the question is stated in this fashion, is only one of many significant differentiating characteristics. HUD recognies that the delivery of its programs to the vast majority of communities in America requires an approach which differs from that traditionally used in treating the housing and urban development problems of major metropolitan areas. A determination of how that approach should differ in order to effectively deal with the needs and problems of these communities and to what extent the

---

[1] Prepared by the Jacobs Company, Inc., 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.
[2] Office of Small Town Services, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Statement of Background Mission and Program for Office of Small Town Services*, (Washington, D.C., December 1969).

delivery of HUD assistance must explicitly account for the numerous differences among these communities is the basic problem to which this study is addressed.

SCOPE OF STUDY

The purview of this study is limited to cities, towns or villages of under 50,000 population. Consequently the nature of the inquiry is primarily concerned with issues, analysis and comparison of communities which fall within a population spectrum whose upper limit is 50,000. Other than in very broad heuristic terms, the study makes no attempt at relating the findings on these "small cities" to results of similar research on the larger metropolitan areas.

In keeping with the time and cost constraints of this study, the number of communities which were selected for in-depth analysis, was thirty-six. In conjunction with the major study effort by The Jacobs Company, a supporting study on the needs and problems of minority residents in communities where minority groups are a significant proportion of the population was carried out by Roy Littlejohn Associates. This effort made an analysis of eight communities, four of which were among the thirty-six included in the major study and four others which were done independently. The total sample of forty communities was selected with the intent of insuring that (1) it was broadly representative of the total population of United States cities of less than 50,000 population and (2) it contained examples of cities with characteristics which, it was felt, should be covered under this research effort. These characteristics are spelled out in detail in Section I of this report.

The analysis of Federal assistance focuses principally on the programs of HUD, but also includes the functional areas of housing and water, sewer and waste treatment facilities, since in these areas other Federal agencies are also providing financial and technical assistance to small communities. In the area of housing the analysis extends to the operations of the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture. Evaluation of other Federal assistance in the areas of water, sewer and waste treatment facilities includes the programs of the Economic Development Administration, the Water Pollution Control Administration, the Farmers Home Administration and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

An analysis of the "needs" and "problems" of small communities has a number of significant dimensions. Such terms are to a large extent subjective and can be determined from various points of view from within, and outside the community. In view of a possible dichotomy of opinion concerning these areas, emphasis has been directed toward investigating the expressions of several segments of the community as well as relying on the experience and knowledge of the interview teams to make the concluding determination of a community's problems and needs.

The analysis of Federal programs lends itself to the same type of subjectivity but also incorporates an additional judgmental dimension. For example, if Federal programs are meeting the needs as generally perceived by a given community, a conclusion by the study team that community needs were not properly identified would tend to result in

70-132—71——2

the conclusion that Federal programs were not meeting the "real" needs of small communities. And if a community perceived its needs in the same manner as the study team, it would still be possible for Federal programs to be inadequate in these areas. The question of just how much the Federal government should do to meet small community needs is a controversial and subjective issue which is not directly dealt with in this study. Rather what is focused on regarding Federal programs is their direction, emphasis, requirements and dilevery systems in terms of the "real" problems and needs of small communities.

The issue of the effectiveness of the delivery system of Federal assistance, particularly HUD program assistance, is central to many aspects of this study. The analysis of this delivery system includes not only the content and administration of the programs from the Federal and regional and in some cases the state levels but also stresses the capacity and capability of local communities to effectively absorb and manage the assistance being received. Having broadly defined the delivery system in this fashion the study team is in a position to more effectively evaluate the particular problem areas arising in connection with the provision of HUD assistance to small communities in the United States.

In evaluating and interpreting the results of this research effort one must keep in mind the relatively small sample of communities studied. While a sample of thirty six communities is fully adequate to provide the study team with the necessary depth of information and the familiarity with an insight into the small community environment, it does not provide a basis upon which valid statistical hypothesis can be formulated. Nevertheless, the inferences of the conclusions and recommendations are clear and well documented with supporting evidence.

OUTLINE OF STUDY

Section I of this report deals with the methodolgy developed and utilized throughout the research stages of the study effort. Principal emphasis is placed upon the process of selection of the communities.

Section II discusses the design of the Small Community Profile and provides a detailed description of its organization and content.

Section III is a definition and classification of small communities. This section attempts to place this study within a context of other related research efforts. Particular attention is devoted to a careful delineation of the differences of the approach embodied in this study. A system of classification of communities is also presented in this section. The functional relationship between this classification scheme and the small community profile is developed in detail, and its derivation from the experience in the 36 communities is made clearly apparent.

Section IV explores community needs and problems. Relying heavily on the factor analysis (which provides the basis for the classification system), the approach centers around four sectors of the small community environment: governmental, economic, physical and social. The general intent of this section is to present an aggregate picture of needs an problems. In addition to the above, six areas of the community analysis deserve special consideration and are discussed indi-

vidually. These are: small community perceptions concentrating on the views of the community leadership versus those of minority groups; the small community and intergovernmental relations; small community leadership and involvment; small community needs for outside assistance; the use of federal programs by small communities; and community experiences in the use of Federal programs.

Section V contains an evaluation of Federal programs for small communities. The content of this section reflects a detailed analysis of all HUD programs affecting small communities as well as other Federal assistance in the functional areas cited previously. In addition to the analysis of the community profiles and the work of other researchers, numerous interviews with program officials at the regional, state and federal levels contributed significantly to this evaluation.

There are three appendices to this report. Appendix A contains a sample of the Small Community Profile. Appendix B, bound separately, consists of the completed profiles for each of the 36 communities studied under the contract. Appendix C is a bibliography.

Section I. Methodology and Selection of Communities

A research effort of the scope and magnitude of this study requires a carefully articulated methodology which not only clearly states the overall approach to be utilized but also supecifies the detailed strategy and tactics under which the study is to be carried out. In this section of the report the approach and mechanics of the research stages of the study will be presented in considerable detail. The discussion will be centered around the three major operational stages of the research effort: the preliminary analysis, the selection of communities, and the plan for and conduct of the on-site interviews. The major analytical aspects of the study will primarily be addressed to Sections III–V of the report.

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

The first major task to be addressed was the whole process of becoming familiar with the array of HUD programs which are available to small communities as well as functionally similar programs of other Federal agencies. This task was not only concerned with the content of the programs themselves but also the administrative aspects of their delivery. The mechanics of this familiarization process were concentrated on two fronts. The first involved numerous interviews with Federal program officials in Washington while the second entailed visits to the regional offices of HUD. The interviews with HUD officials in the Washington office covered individuals from the following offices: Metropolitan Development, Renewal and Housing Assistance, Model Cities, Federal Housing Administration, and Equal Opportunity.

The staff of the office of Small Town Services was also very helpful in providing information and insight into the content of HUD programs. Contacts outside of HUD encompassed representatives of the following agencies; the Economic Development Administration (Department of Commerce); the Office of Rural Affairs (OEO); the Farmers Home Administration and the Soil Conservation Service (USDA); the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (In-

terior Department); the Public Health Service (HEW); and the Applachian Regional Commission. In addition to the above, two public interest groups were contacted and oriented on the purpose and content of the study. These were the National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors and the International City Management Association.

As noted above visits were made to the six mainland HUD regional offices. At each office representatives (Assistant Regional Administrators and other staff members) of the following program areas were interviewed: Metropolitan Development, Renewal Assistance, Housing Assistance, Federal Housing Administration, Model Cities, Equal Opportunity, and Program Coordination and Services. In addition to briefing the regional staffs on the study project, the following topics were discussed: the particular experiences of the regional offices with small communities, the activities of state governments in relation to HUD programs; and the identification of small communities which would make good candidates for on-site analysis. The regional office meetings provided a valuable input for the study by those staff individuals who had the greatest direct contact and experiences with local governments.

Based upon those interviews and program reviews supplemented by a search of available literature, a reference manual, "HUD and Other Related Programs Pertaining to Small Communities," was prepared for use by the research team. This document insured that each member of the study team had a complete understanding of the relevant programs and provided a convenient vehicle for disseminating the substance of the above interviews to the team members not directly involved.

In order to insure complete coverage of all elements of the delivery system of HUD assistance to small communities, state offices of community affairs in all states with communities in the study were contacted by letter and informed of the study. Their general thoughts and comments on small community needs and problems and specific information on the communities selected for study were solicited.

The second major task of the preliminary stage of the study was to assemble all relevant data and other available information on small communities and review completed and on-going studies which cover issues and problems related to this research. An extensive inventory of such studies was obtained from the Science Information Exchange. Studies suggested from this source as well as numerous other articles and reports which contributed to background and understanding are listed in the bibliography in Appendix C.

The data which was collected at this time provided the major source of information needed for the selection of communities and in addition formed the basis for the statistical portion of the small community profile. While a complete list of such sources is shown in the bibliography a few of the most important deserve mention. The most heavily utilized resources were the City and County Data Book, the ICMA Municipal Yearbook and the OEO Community Profiles. Much additional information on the communities was obtained from reading the 701 financed Comprehensive Plans, and the workable program and community renewal programs for those communities in which they had been completed. These documents were made available by HUD.

Also obtained from a number of sources within HUD was a complete listing of all Federal program grants and loans for each community in the sample. This list was checked and updated wherever necessary during the field visits.

The problem of comparability of data was a constant hurdle throughout the study. As is well known the extent and nature of recorded statistics varies according to the size of the community. For the purposes of this study the major limitation was for those communities under 10,000 in population. In an attempt to offset this inadequacy use was made of the OEO community profiles which gave additional information on the county in which the community was located. The primary problem, however, was the non-comparability of years in which the data was collected. Census data is almost 10 years old and although extensive reliance was placed on its use, the inadequacies of doing so are obvious.

Information from the OEO Information Center as well as that from locally produced reports had no consistent time frame. Some of these data limitations would have existed regardless of the timing of the study, but the fact that the study had to rely on 1960 census data places a considerable limitation on certain aspects of the study. For example the use of the unemployment rate as a key variable in describing and classifying communities is obvious. However, the best uniform record of this statistic was in the 1960 census and since only a few cities have reasons for developing more recent statistics and many communities at the time of the field visit had little or no detailed notion of unemployment figures, it was necessary to exclude this variable from the cross-community analysis and classification scheme.

The last major task of the preliminary analysis was the development of the community profile. A detailed discussion of this process and a description of its final product is presented in Section II of the report. It should be noted however, that all members of the study team actively participated in the development of the profile, each person being responsible for that area in which he was most professionally competent.

As part of the methodology it is important to place the minority group study within the context of the overall research effort. Although the effort by Roy Littlejohn Associates was performed as a separate entity, the approach adopted in the minority group study paralleled that used in the general study. While the general study effort involved all aspects of the community environment and stressed the perceptions of the community leadership both to the public and the private sectors, the minority group study was constrained to an analysis of those aspects of the community which were relevant to the minority group environment and sought only the perceptions of the minority residents as to the needs and problems of small communities. The emphasis was on the recording of perceptions and attitudes, with little attempt to develop supporting evidence as was done under the general study.

The minority group study analyzed eight communities, four of these communities were included in the 36 investigated by the general study team and four were done independently. Although it undoubtedly would have been preferable to have done all eight jointly, this

would have excessively constrained the selection of communities under the main study. The approach finally adopted still permitted a significant comparison of perceptions of needs and problems by community leadership and as viewed by minority groups, and provided the additional benefit of allowing a wider range of total perception by adding four communities to the overall sample.

The conclusions of the minority group study are contained in a separate report. A comparison of the differences in the perception of small community needs and problems is described in Section IV of this report.

SELECTION OF COMMUNITIES

The approach used in the selection of communities was to make a preliminary selection using a limited number of delineating characteristics and then reducing the sample size in stages by means of employing additional information and criteria. A preliminary list of 67 communities was developed and then gradually reduced to 36. In effect the selection process involved a two step procedure. First, all cities within the population brackets of 2,500 to 50,000 were grouped according to 6 basic geographic, economic and governmental categories. Then the lists of cities within each of these categories was matched against a detailed set of characteristics which are relevant to this study. The final result is a sample of 36 small communities exhibiting a maximum number of significant elements in terms of the objectives of the study. This process is defined in more detail below.

In attempting to develop an understanding and insight into the distribution of all small communities, the 5,100 communities defined as urban places by the 1960 census with populations of between 2,500 and 50,000 were catagorized by six criteria. The criteria used were felt to be the most important in terms of delineating communities with only a limited number of variables.[1]

The six characteristics were:

(1) The HUD region in which the community was located. A decision was made to limit the study to communities in the continental United States.

(2) Population. The communities were sorted by the following standard census population brackets: 2,500 to 5,000; 5,000 to 10,000; 10,000 to 25,000; and 25,000 to 50,000.

(3) The rate of population growth from 1950 to 1960. Three categories were established for this purpose—growth of more than 20 percent; between 20 percent growth and a 5 percent decline; and a greater than 5 percent decline in population.

(4) Location within or outside an SMSA.

(5) Presence within or outside an EDA designated area. Since EDA designation criteria include low income and/or high employment this characteristic is quite informative of economic conditions.

[1] As will be demonstrated in Section III the results of the analysis show that four of the variables are extremely meaningful for purposes of classification. Of the other two, the HUD regional designation is too encompassing and the EDA designation, which is based on income and employment levels, could not be used for reasons discussed earlier.

(6) The form of government, in particular the presence or absence of a council-manager form of government. There was no attempt to place a value judgment on this particular governmental form, but rather it was selected as being a proxy for professionalism in local government.

Utilizing these six characteristics, approximately 5,100 communities were coded, punched on cards and fed into a computer. A program was written which sorted the communities into a matrix whose cells were characterized by a particular combination of the six variables listed above. Having calculated the density of each cell, that is, the number of communities which had the particular combination of characteristic values which defined that cell, it was possible to develop a meaningful distribution of urban places.

This procedure provided the study team with a norm against which it could compare the distribution of the sample to be selected and precisely determine how "representative" these communities were of all small communities in the United States. After the selection of the final sample of 36 communities this test was made with the following results. Taking into account all six characteristics the sample selected was representative of 707 small communities. In other words, there are this number of cities which have the same values for all six characteristics as the one of 36 communities in the sample. If the criterion of regional location (which is the least significant) is ignored, it can be shown that the sample is representative of 2,481 cities which is just less than 50%.

While these statistics show that the 36 communities are broadly representative, it is also important to note that the sample includes considerable diversification and some uniqueness. For example, 10 of the communities selected are representative of fewer than 6 towns in the HUD region in which they are located, while 2 which were selected are the only observations in the cell.

Having completed this first stage of the selection process a detailed set of additional characteristics was developed. Information on these characteristics was collected on approximately one hundred communities. Each of these communities possessed at least one of the criteria which are relevant to this study. A complete list of the additional criteria used in the final selection process is as follows:

(1) extent of use of HUD programs
(2) no experience with HUD programs
(3) economic classification (categories used in 1967 Municipal Year Book)
(4) city in states with constitutional, financial, and debt limitations
(5) model city
(6) model city application not approved
(7) new community
(8) twin towns (adjacent communities in two different state jurisdictions)
(9) percent minority population: Blacks, Indians, Spanish-American, etc.
(10) dependency profile

(11) median years of school completed
(12) median family income
(13) percent of families with incomes below $3,000
(14) unemployment rate
(15) percent sound housing
(16) percent of housing built in 1939 or earlier
(17) median home value
(18) riot or civil disturbance

In some cases this list was supplemented by additional information of the type covered in the community data section of the small community profile but since the information was only available on a random basis at the time of the sample selection it is not listed above.

One other important input to the selection process was the recommendation of HUD. In the visits to the six HUD regional offices the preliminary list of communities in each respective region was presented and comments and recommendations were requested. Of the 36 communities selected, 26 were initially recommended by HUD program personnel.

In the final selection process, diversity of specific types under each of the above characteristics was emphasized. For example, under the economic classification category full coverage of the major types was insured but also a number of examples of specialized cities were chosen. In selecting specific communities an attempt was made to cover as many different factors as possible with each community selected. In summary then, the two stage selection process was designed to insure that the sample chosen would be both broadly representative of the small communities of America and still cover the full range of characteristics which the study team felt was relevant to the study.

The thirty-six communities in the sample selected through this process are listed below. They are listed in the order in which they were visited in the field survey:

Lebanon, Pennsylvania
Cape May, New Jersey
Martinsburg, West Virginia
Cambridge, Maryland
Chaska, Minnesota
Montevideo, Minnesota
Glasgow, Montana
Atoka, Oklahoma
McAllen, Texas
Roseburg, Oregon
Seaside, California
Cypress, California
North Las Vegas, Nevada
Pitcairn, Pennsylvania
Martins Ferry, Ohio
Dunkirk, New York
Atchison, Kansas
Carthage, Missouri
Trinidad, Colorado
Brown Deer, Wisconsin
Traverse City, Michigan
Waverly, Iowa
Middletown, Connecticut
Bath, Maine
Winchendon, Massachusetts
Robbins, Illinois
Clinton, Indiana
Carbondale, Illinois
Smithville, Tennessee
Tupelo, Mississippi
Smyrna, Georgia
Big Stone Gap, Virginia
Gastonia, North Carolina
Winchester, Kentucky

The tables below summarize the distributions of the main characteristics found in the 36 communities listed above.

Characteristic	*Number of cities*
(1) HUD region:	
(*a*) Region I	4
(*b*) Region II	6
(*c*) Region III	5
(*d*) Region IV	9
(*e*) Region V	7
(*f*) Region VI	5
(2) Population size:	
(*a*) 0 to 5,0000	6
(*b*) 5 to 10,000	7
(*c*) 10 to 25,000	16
(*d*) 25 to 50,000	7
(3) Population change 1960 to Present: [1]	
(*a*) Over 20 percent increase	13
(*b*) Over 7 percent but less than 20 percent	13
(*c*) Less than seven percent increase	10
(4) Cities within an SMSA	7
(5) Cities with a council-manager form of government	17
(6) Cities within an economic development district, redevelopment area, or the Appalachian economic development region	16
(7) Economic classification: [2]	
(*a*) Manufacturing	16
(*b*) Diversified manufacturing	3
(*c*) Diversified retailing	2
(*d*) Retailing	7
(*e*) Dormitory	9
(*f*) Resort	2
(*g*) Mining	1
(*h*) Government	1
(*i*) Education	1
(8) Median family income:	
(*a*) Under $4,600	12
(*b*) Between $4,600 and $5,400	12
(*c*) Over $5,400	12
(9) Percent of minority population:	
(*a*) 0 to 5	17
(*b*) 5 to 15	9
(*c*) Over 15	10
(10) Population age 65 and over:	
(*a*) 0 to 8 percent	10
(*b*) 8 to 12 percent	10
(*c*) Over 12 percent	13
(11) Median number of years of school completed:	
(*a*) Under 9.5	11
(*b*) 9.5 to 11	14
(*c*) Over 11	11

[1] It should be noted that the definition of this variable in terms of the time period covered and the categories employed is different from that utilized during the selection process.

[2] Since in some cases more than one classification was given to a city, the figures total to more than 36.

The selection of the additional four communities for the minority group study was based on a similar set of criteria. In selecting these cities an attempt was made to increase the minority representation of the total sample while following the emphasis on diversity of other characteristics stressed in the general study.

FIELD PLAN AND ON-SITE SURVEY

The process of carrying out the on-site evaluation of the communities was facilitated by considerable advance preparation including a carefully developed schedule of community visits.

The initial contact with the sample communities was a telephone conversation with the chief executive in which the nature of the study, the fact that his community had been selected and the approximate time of the visit was explained. (An additional contact was made just prior to the study team's visit to make known the exact time of arrival.) During this conversation the communities were asked to provide the study team with the following background materials:

(1) A copy of the city budget and number of personnel (distributed by function—e.g. police, fire, public works, etc.) for the current year and five years ago.

(2) A copy of the latest auditor's report.

(3) A street map.

(4) A copy of the local newspaper.

(5) Any available descriptive literature about the city (e.g. chamber of commerce brochures, etc.).

(6) Any recent annual reports to the citizens of the community.

The approach used to conduct the field portion of the study emphasized the utilization of qualified professionals in the on-site interviews. Two interview teams of two members each conducted the field evaluation of the thirty-six communities. One team member was a specialist in public administration and finance and concentrated on interviewing leaders in the public sector. The other team member was an economist who focused principally on the private sector with special emphasis on the business and financial sectors. Either team member interviewed citizen groups, newspaper editors etc., depending upon the relative pressures on their respective schedules.

Upon entering a community the initial contact was with the mayor or chief executive officer. He was given a detailed statement on the purpose of the study as well as an outline of the positions/people the team wanted to interview while in the community. In nearly every instance the city government officials were extremely cooperative in setting up interview schedules, providing a tour of the community, and being of assistance in any areas that were requested of them. The study team found nearly 100 percent cooperation from the individuals being interviewed.

A list of the 16 positions in the public and private sectors that were covered during the interviews is presented in the next section. Since in many cases more than one representative of each position was interviewed, the average number of people in each community with whom the team had substantive discussions was approximately 25. In all communities, the team talked with at least 2 of the predominant employers and two bankers.

In order to insure some familiarity with all communities surveyed, the composition of the two teams was switched every two weeks. This resulted in a much broader perspective by the four team members on the study and evaluation of any particular community.

The period during which the community surveys took place extended from the second week of September to the second week of De-

cember 1969. In order to check the methodology of the on-site analysis, the first four communities studied in September were included in a test program. Following visits to these communities, the entire research team met and reviewed the results. It was generally concluded that the on-site studies went very well with good cooperation from local officials. Some minor adjustments were made to clarify some points in the profile.

While in the communities contact was made with state officials who had expressed interest in the study by responding to the initial letter which was sent to the states. In two communities, the team met with staff people from the HUD regional offices.

In order to follow up on questions which had arisen during the visits to the community and to pursue additional information on Federal program content and admiinstration, additional interviews were held in Washington with the following offices: the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; the National Association of Housing and Renewal Officials; the Office of Intergovernmental Relations; the Rural Housing Loan division of the Farmers Home Administration; the Office of Planning Assistance and Standards in HUD; and the Office of Small Town Services and Intergovernmental Relations.

The remainder of this report, with the exception of the following section deals with the analysis and evaluation of the information gathered during the preliminary analysis and on-site evaluation stages of the study. The methodology associated with this analysis will be described in the relevant sections of this report.

Section II. Small Community Profile

The purpose of the small community profile was to provide a vehicle through which the study team could analyze the needs and problems of small communities in a context which is meaningful, for an evaluation of Federal Program assistance. An important component of this study is an analysis of the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and other Federal programs which may operate in the environment of the small community. Another factor, critical to the successful attainment of the goals of this study is the development of an awareness of the problems and needs of small cities. Given these two elements, the profile provides a mechanism through which the total relationship between problems and the programs can be analyzed and the "delivery system" by which Federal, in particular HUD, program assistance is made available to small cities can be evaluated. The profile in fact structures the very way in which one thinks about small communities. Program planning requires the capability of saying that one small community is different from another in a number of significant ways. An examination of two community profiles should be able to highlight these differences.

In order to assure achievement of these objectives, the development of the small community profile (SCP) was carried out within a carefully formulated design. A discussion of that profile design as well as a description of the actual profile will be presented in this section.

DESIGN OF THE SMALL COMMUNITY PROFILE

The SCP developed and used in this study incorporated three different approaches to analyzing the required depth and breadth of information on the small community. These approaches are embodied in the three sections of the SCP: (1) a community data section which encompasses readily available statistical information on the basic social, economic and demographic parameters of the community to be studied; (2) an extensive list of detailed questions concerning many particular aspects of the community's capabilities, needs, and problems; and (3) a number of general questions in which an overall community analysis, may be meaningfully couched. Each of these components, it was found, had a comparative advantage in procuring certain types of information not easily gathered under either of the other two approaches. Furthermore, information gathered on the same subject area under all three sections of the profile tended to be very complementary, and permitted a fully comprehensive analysis of that subject. A more detailed treatment of each of these components of the SCP will clarify the significance of these observations.

The organization of the first two sections of the profile is centered around four areas of inquiry each dealing with a major sector of the small community environment. The four areas are government, economic, physical and social. An explanation of each of these areas is presented later in this section in order that the overall intent of each can be clearly defined. Copies of all sections of the profile may also be found in Appendix A.

The community data section of the SCP was designed with the primary intent of procuring and organizing that information on which some "objective definition" of a particular small town environment could be drawn. Prior to the on-site evaluation of the communities, all available sources for this information were examined with the result that a substantial portion of the community data section was completed in advance. In addition to the readily available statistical sources, e.g., the City-County Data Book, the Municipal Yearbook, the OEO county profiles, the study team also examined the information on these communities which was made available by HUD. The workable program and the comprehensive plan were studied for all communities for which these documents were available. Additional information was also obtained from the community renewal program and other special reports which were available in the HUD library files on the selected communities. The assimilation of the relevant information from these sources in the community data section resulted in an excellent vehicle through which it was possible to develop an advanced concept of a community. When supplemented with the material sent by the cities, the study team was in a position to be quite knowledgeable about each community prior to its arrival and was prepared to discuss the more substantive issues of the field investigations without excessive loss of time.

Some of the information called for in the community data section is only readily obtainable when in the community. Consequently the last inputs to this section were gathered during the actual field interviews.

When looking at the individual profiles for each of the 36 cities, it will be noted that the completed community data section is not presented. In its place, a table of community indicators has been used. This table contains the data on those variables which it was felt are most descriptive of the small community environment. Since all of the statistics in the data section were utilized in assembling and writing the profiles it would have been redundant to include it in a separate section.

The principal component of the SCP is the Community Analysis Section. It is composed of 237 different questions covering the four areas of analysis. Each of these questions addresses itself to one of two broad areas of inquiry. A majority focus on defining and describing the environment with heavy concentration on the needs and problems of the community as well as its capabilities to overcome them. The other questions are concerned with the delivery of Federal assistance to the community—the programs themselves, the administrative aspects of the delivery system for these programs, and the relationship between the needs of the community for the particular type of assistance being provided through these programs. A large number of questions are straightforward and once having obtained a definitive response, there is no need to ask the question again. Other questions, on the other hand, called for opinions and judgments on the part of the interviewees and were designed to be asked of a number of people in each community.

In order to gain the best possible answers to questions in the former category as well as procure a balanced response to those that are more subjective in nature, the profile is subdivided into groups of questions which should be asked of specific positions/people in the community. It is important to note the ordering in which this task was accomplished. The profile was fully completed before any attempts at subdividing it into component categories. Then a list of community positions, which it was felt should be covered in the field interviews, was assembled. That list is as follows:

FIGURE II–1. LIST OF COMMUNITY POSITIONS

1. Mayor/City Manager
2. City Planner/Building Inspector
3. City Engineer/Street Superintendent
4. Redevelopment Authority Director
5. Housing Authority Director
6. County Planner/Non-Metropolitan Planning District
7. Health and Welfare Representatives
8. Model Cities Director
9. City Librarian
10. County Farmers Home Administration Supervisor
11. Community Action Agency
12. Chamber of Commerce/Jaycees
13. Major Employer
14. Banker
15. School Superintendent
16. Newspaper Editor/Public Interest Groups

The final step consisted of going through the entire community analysis section of the profile and determining those questions which should be asked of each position/person.

The actual profiles which were used during the field interviews were organized according to the positions being interviewed. This permitted a much more concise and consistent interview format which insured comparability of the same position among all communities studied. Appendix A contains a copy of the aggregate profile. In order to indicate the positions to which each of the questions were addessed each question of the profile has been coded. The numbers which appear after each question correspond to the numbers of the positions shown in Figure II–1 above.

The third and smallest component of the SCP consists of five sets of questions involved with "general issues." While the community analysis section probed deeply into many specific areas of inquiry these questions were designed to permit flexibility of response. They afforded the interviewee the opportunity to talk about his community in the aggregate thus permitting him to express an overall view which might not have been evident during the remainder of the interview. In addition, this approach permitted the interviewee to broach an entirely new area of discussion the importance of which had not been anticipated by members of the study team and therefore ignored. Another function of these general questions was the chance to return to an area of discussion which for any number of reasons might have been inadequately covered previously. The use of these general issues in conjunction with the community analysis section of the profile permitted the interviewer to be flexible in structuring the conversation to his needs, while creating an atmosphere conducive to opening up on the part of the interviewee.

As in the case of the community data section, the latter two components of the profile served as working papers for the analysis of the 36 communities. The profiles of each of these communities, to be found in Appendix B, reflect the organization and content of the original components of the SCP but are written in narrative form to facilitate comprehension. It should be noted that completed questionaires on each community underlie the reporting and analysis which are evidenced in these completed profiles.

Before describing in detail the content of the SCP, a comment should be made on the future use of this profile. Given the purposes of this study, the results obtained from the SCP were very satisfying. It resulted in depth and balance which were both essential to the field analysis. The SCP in its present form is certainly too detailed for use as a survey tool. If it were to be adapted for this use more data questions would have to be added in an attempt to get at much of the information which the SCP develops in the community analysis section. On the other hand, if the intent of the investigator was to do an encompassing, in-depth analysis of a small community, he would find the treatment of many areas much too cursory. In conclusion then, the SCP developed as part of this contract should be viewed as an excellent research tool for doing work on small cities which closely parallels the level of effort in community analysis and evaluation called for here. Where this is not the case, however, the investi-

gator should carefully weigh how his approach differs from this and the likely impact those differences should have on his profile.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SMALL COMMUNITY PROFILE

The SCP contains three distinct types of information: (i) information and data on the "real" characteristics of the community; (ii) information on community capabilities; and (iii) information on problems as perceived by the community. The latter two categories involve human behavior and subjective perception and judgment and are therefore contrasted with the real characteristics of the community. As noted earlier, the basic organization of the SCP is in terms of four major sectors of analysis: governmental, economic, physical and social. The profile questions are designed to elicit all three types of information for each of the sectors of the community environment. An examination of the content of each of these areas within the profile will reveal that this is indeed the case.

Governmental sector

The local government and other public bodies operating in the community have principal responsibility for crystallizing into plans and programs the needs and desires of its residents. The government section of the SCP analyzes and evaluates three basic factors that are indicative of this role: (1) physical, financial, and manpower capabilities and potential; (2) problems and needs of the governmental units; and (3) efforts to both maximize capabilities and solve problems through the use of both financial and technical assistance from the private sector and other governmental levels.

The form of governmental structure gives some indication of effective policy direction and administrative implementation. This reflects the type of government, the types and compositions of departments, boards and commissions, the legislative authorizations or constraints dealing with such matters as local home rule, provisions for annexations or consolidations, and the sharing of services. Community and political stability are important factors in analyzing community direction. The lack of rapid political turnover and change in governmental policy, and the minimum amount of intra-community conflict and indecision may indicate a progressive attitude and movement toward meeting and solving community problems. However, it may also reflect a status quo policy and community apathy. The analysis based on SCP content is directed toward establishing which of these two situations are present.

The degree of contact and coordination of program effort with other government agencies, both horizontal and vertical, reflects a realization that community problems transcend political boundaries and can only be solved through common effort and purpose. The city's financial resources are a major indicator of the government's capacity to provide community services. The extent and degree of financial limitations embodied in state and local statutes has a marked effect on both the number and level of services that are carried out. The adoption and implementation of a capital improvement program indicates the importance attached to long-range fiscal planning. The absence of an

effective personnel system may result in difficulties in the hiring and retention of qualified employees. Obtaining information on all of these issues is addressed in the SCP.

Community planning is an absolutely essential ingredient for any community that is concerned with both the present and future uses of its physical environment. The practicality of the community's planning policies and the methods by which they are being implemented receive major emphasis in the analysis of this sector.

The type and level of services provided again indicates both what the government feels the public sector should spend, what priorities should be established and what the citizens feel they can afford. Questions dealing with such public services as police, fire, public works, health, sanitation, welfare, housing, education, recreation, planning, finance, and general administration are included. Information is obtained with respect to the scope and effectiveness of these services, the placement of responsibility for the respective services, and the local community effort expended as represented by manpower and costs.

Finally the use or non-use of Federal programs is investigated to determine whether or not the community has explored sources of financial and technical aid at the Federal level. Questions on state involvement are also included. This area of inquiry reveals the strengths and weaknesses of Federal programs and where they can be better oriented toward meeting and solving community needs and problems.

Economic sector

A knowledge of the structure and functioning of a city's economy is fundamental to the SCP and to the analysis of small community problems. The extent and character of the economic activity are the basic forces determining the overall viability of the community. What is termed the community's economy is a system of production, consumption and distribution activities embracing the sum total productive activity within the city which is dependent to a marked degree on the facilities and services available within the city.

Within the economic section of the SCP, the capacity of the city to function as a viable economic unit is ascertained. It is necessary to look at the viability of the local economy, not only in terms of its overall balance and stability, but also with respect to its capacity to muster its resources in order to effectively carry out in the planning, financing and implementation of programs with the possible advice and assistance of state and Federal programs. As such, the economic component of the profile serves two principal functions.

First, it describes the basic economic institutions and industrial and employment patterns which are resident in the city. Recent trends as well as short-term business expectations are focused upon here, in an attempt to detect any discernible trends in this pattern. This descriptive aspect of the profile focuses on population and labor force characteristics, the development patterns of industry and commerce, the adequacy of existing transportation facilities, and the role of financial institutions in the functioning and further development of the city's economy.

Secondly, the economic leadership, covering the industrial, commercial, and financial sectors, is analyzed in order to develop an under-

standing of and a capacity to evaluate the leadership and support which these economic aspects of the city contribute to the successful application of Federal programs in the city. Here any evidence is elicited which would indicate the existence of business groups and organizations and their attempts, if any, to enhance the industrial development and general business prospects of the city. Important in this analysis is the need to discuss the businessmen's attitude toward the city, which is partially evidenced by his direct participation in city activities.

Having evaluated the evidence relating to these two functions will permit the study team to adequately analyze the total economic environment of the city as it relates to the more program oriented sections of the SCP.

Physical sector

The physical condition of cities has been a major concern of local, state and national authorities for many years. The first Federal programs to assist localities in the improvement of urban life were in the area of housing. Thirty years later, the provisions of sufficient, adequate housing continues to draw attention as the nation's highest domestic priority.

The second major area to which the resources of Federal and state government have been addressed, is urban renewal. The removal of blight and the concomitant development of improved residential, commercial, and industrial areas is viewed as a basic determinant in the improvement of urban life.

Within the last decade, interest has focused on other physical aspects of the urban structure. These have included the provision of basic utilities (water and sanitary facilities), community facilities, recreational areas, and other physical amenities. All of these programs are intended to provide the community with a physical environment which is beneficial in terms of the development of the city and its inhabitants.

With these considerations in mind the physical section of the SCP includes a series of statements relating to the condition and needs of the city in relation to housing, urban renewal, community facilities and environmental conditions. With regard to housing, information reflecting the rate and amount of new construction, the composition and distribution of the housing stock, trends in the supply of housing, the extent of substandard housing and the market for subsidized housing is requested. This information on housing will be related to governmental activity and organization with respect to planning, zoning, code enforcement, redevelopment, and other evidences of local government involvement. Questions on water, sewer, gas and electric utility services, whether provided by the local government or by private sources are explored in order to determine their adequacy in terms of present and future requirements. All of these statements are intended to develop an understanding of the efforts which the city has made in improving its physical environment, its plans along these lines for the future, the mechanisms which have been used, and the problems which have been encountered.

70-132—71——3

Social sector

The quality of urban life is directly related to the provision of social programs: health and medical care, welfare assistance, educational sources and cultural programs. These programs have traditionally been provided by a varying mix of public and private sponsors. In more recent years, the inability of the private sector to furnish such programs has placed an increasing burden on public institutions.

In analysing the needs and problems of small communities and in determining the potentials for growth and development through Federal assistance programs, it is necessary to evaluate the current level of social program activity in the cities under study and to determine the areas of greatest need.

The SCP analyses the major social characteristics of the city in terms of the social facilities and services which are available and how well they meet the needs of the community both for the present and in the future. In particular, emphasis is placed on several areas. Health and medical services and facilities, include an analysis of the availability and provision of comprehensive personal and environmental health and medical services through both the private and governmental sectors. Education programs and facilities, include an analysis and evaluation of basic elementary and secondary education, adult education, technical training and the availability of high education facilities are also examined. Recreational and cultural programs and facilities, community, social and welfare services as well as the issue of community involvement are also dealt with in the social section of the SCP.

An additional note on the narrative SCP's found in Appendix B is in order. The community profiles written for each of the 36 communities contain an additional section on the use of Federal programs. This section includes a list of all such programs which have been used by the community along with meaningful comments on the programs themselves. While many of these points made in this section could be incorporated elsewhere in the profile, it was felt that given their importance to the study, highlighting them in a separate section was advisable.

Section III. Definition and Classification of Small Communities

An effective delivery of Federal assistance to small communities requires considerable knowledge of the small community environment and in particular those things that differentiate this group of cities from other recipients of Federal program assistance. The purpose of this section is to analyze the requirements for a meaningful definition of the small community and to devise a classification scheme which will provide a vehicle through which key aspects in the success of the delivery system of Federal programs can be related to important characteristics of small communities.

DEFINITION OF SMALL COMMUNITIES

There are many possible definitions of a small community and which one is used depends largely on the purpose to be served. Given the focus of this study, an appropriate definition should show characteris-

tics which are meaningful in terms of providing outside assistance to the community.

The two broadest definitions of small communities that have been traditionally used are based on size and location. An example of the use of these characteristics for definitional purposes which is of interest to this study is reflected by the many HUD programs that are described and/or administered on the basis of one of these two characteristics. Examples of the size criteria are: the Title VIII program which is limited to communities under 100,000 in population; the "701" program which is restricted to communities under 50,000; the Urban Renewal program which contains special provisions in the size of the Federal share for cities under 50,000. A similar list of examples can be shown for location: the special programs available to those located in Appalachia; planning grants for non-metropolitan areas; as well as the programs of the Agriculture Department which cover rural areas under 5,500.

The conclusion of this study in no way shows reasons to disagree with the use of these characteristics in defining program content and application. Indeed some of the recommendations deal directly with this issue. Size has provided the basis for the most generally used definition. It is still found to be the most pervasive element in defining a small community for the purposes of programing assistance. In this analysis of small communities the factor of population has been reviewed in detail and found to be the singularly most important element.

Reliance on any one particular factor whether it be size, location or some other barometer however, cannot provide a suitable definition in terms of programming aid to small communities. In addition, characteristics relating to the program elements themselves must be considered. For example, when involved in the delivery of some health program, it would be necessary to focus on community health statistics and probably a number of social indicators as well. Similarly if program assistance is to focus on reducing unemployment or income maintenance, a wide range of economic statistics would have to be considered. Each of these additional sets of indicators has to be developed according to the particular program or function under consideration. And the importance of each of these indicators in the small community environment, of necessity, has to be analyzed separately for each functional approach.

The conclusion that must be drawn therefore is that there is no one universal definition of a small community which can be applied to all aspects of the delivery system of HUD program assistance. The characteristics which are important when considering the planning function for example, may have little or no relevance to some other aspect of that system. The conclusions at the end of this section support this basic premise quite clearly.

Several different definitions are therefore proposed as a result of this study effort. They include definitions by size, by location, and by economic viability. These definitions are designed for the particular requirements of the delivery of Federal programs to small communities and are described in Section V., Federal Assistance to Small Communities.

As has been noted, meaningful definitions of small communities must consider a number of facets, which tend not to be consistent throughout all relevant functional areas. In order to provide a vehicle through which all possible interrelationships between important community indicators and major functional areas of concern can be systematically stated, a classification system for the study of small communities has been developed.

CLASSIFICATION OF SMALL COMMUNITIES

In line with traditional areas of community definitions a number of classification schemes have been developed. Among the more significant bases that have been utilized to classify cities are: economic function; economic base; regional location; historical and evolutionary, and relationship of cities to their tributary areas. Hadden and Borgatta in their classic work on the social characteristics of American cities make the following observations. "The most extensive and persistent criterion for the classification of cities has been economic or functional specialization. A wide variety of approaches has been utilized, and generally there has been increasing sophistication in the methodology employed in the development of these classifications. However, these classifications have remained ad hoc in character, and there have been only limited efforts to demonstrate that other characteristics of the city or urban milieu could be predicted with this type of classification." [1]

CLASSIFICATION BY FACTOR ANALYSIS

In order to overcome some of these shortcomings, the factor analytic approach to community classification has been developed. The basic approach of factor analysis is to develop a limited list of key community parameters which are capable of explaining the major inter-relationships within a ocmmunity environment.[2] This approach is the basis for the methodology developed and applied in this study. Major differences in the design used in this study should be noted however. Whereas in previous attempts at factor analysis the sample size has been quite large, this sample was limited to 36 communities. Previous efforts tend to rely completely on statistical data and information which can be easily assembled by means of cursory surveys etc. The major emphasis in this approach is the placement of qualified professional analysts in the communities for a number of days to gain first hand knowledge of and contact with many aspects of the community environment so essential to meaningful in-depth analysis.

As noted previously, the relatively small size of the sample prevents the undertaking of any complex statistical econometric manipu-

[1] Borgatta, Edgar F. and Hadden, Jeffrey K., *American Cities: Their Social Characteristics* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965), pp. 28–29.

[2] A more complete discussion of factor analysis can be found on pages 18–28 of Borgatta and Hadden's study.

lations with the observations. The type of clustering analysis normally employed in a factor-analytic approach would quite assuredly result in vague, indefinite conclusions if applied to a sample of 36 communities. The cost associated with such a task would not warrant its undertaking. If information comparable to that which has been gathered for these 36 communities could be procured for a sample of say 150 cities, the application of such techniques would, without question, result in a systematic statement of all important conclusions between the key parameters of the small town environment. The results of this study effort reflect the same types of specifications and conclusions as would result from this more vigorous approach. The difference lies in the fact that because of the limitations in sample size the analysis is, in general, less systematic and cannot claim to have found *all* the meaningful relationships that might be present in that environment.

The basis for the classification system which will now be presented is the Small Community Profile. Using data and information contained in the profile as well as the judgments of the study team, a list of 38 community characteristics was assembled for each community. While considerable additional information is available from the profiles, this list of characteristics was limited to those that were felt to be most significant. These characteristics are shown as column headings on Table III–1. Eighteen of these characteristics are statistical data series, the other twenty are indices of the subjective rankings by the study team on the nature of the subjects covered.

The cells of the matrix shown in this table show the ratings of the community characteristics. For the twenty series that incorporate judgmental factors, each area or characteristic was ranked in three categories. If a particular characteristic of a community was fairly representative of all communities in the sample it was given an average rating. If it was much better or significantly poorer than the sample norm for that characteristic than a high or low rating was applied respectively. The statistical series were also grouped into three or four categories in order to facilitate the analysis. The detailed rankings for each of these characteristics will be described below.

The row headings of table III–1 are the 36 communities arranged in alphabetical order within population categories (the categories are 0–5,000; 5–10,000; 10–25,000; 25–50,000).

DESCRIPTION OF FACTOR CHARACTERISTICS

In describing this table each characteristic will be treated separately. A discussion of the characteristic itself will be provided along with an explanation of the particular rating that was used for that characteristic. In addition, comment will be made on the distribution of each of these characteristics over all 36 communities, which are shown at the bottom of the table. This serves to convey to the reader some notion of what the representative community in the sample might look like as defined by these characteristics. The characteristics are discussed in the order in which they appear in the table.

TABLE III-1 A CLASSIFICATION RANKING OF SMALL COMMUNITIES

	GOVERNMENTAL					ECONOMIC											
	form of government	government organization and services	fiscal effort	fiscal capacity	planning	population size	percent of population growth	percent minority population	percent elderly population	percent population under 18	median age	location	economic classification	industrial concentration	industry and commerce	employment	banking	transportation
(0-5,000)																		
Atoka	CM	L	L	H	L	LL	M	M	H	L	M	H	Rr	L	M	M	H	M
Big Stone	CM	L	L	H	L	LL	M	M	P	M	M	H	Mg	H	L	L	M	M
Chaska	M	L	H	M	L	LL	H	L	H	M	M	M	Mr/D	L	M	M	M	H
J City Ark	M	L	L	L	L	LL	L	H	M	M	M	H	Ma	L	M	M	H	M
J City LA	M	L	L	L	L	LL	H	H	M	M	L	H	Ma	L	M	M	H	M
Smithville	M	M	L	M	L	LL	H	L	M	M	M	H	Mr	H	M	L	M	M
(5-10,000)																		
Cape May	CM	M	H	L	M	L	M	M	H	L	H	H	X	H	M	M	M	A
Clinton	M	L	L	M	L	L	L	L	H	L	M	M	Ma	L	M	M	L	A
Glasgow	M	M	H	L	M	L	L	M	L	H	L	H	Rr	L	M	L	M	M
Montevideo	CM	H	M	M	M	L	M	L	M	M	H	H	Ma	L	H	H	A	H
Pitcairn	M	L	M	M	L	L	L	L	M	L	M	L	D	L	L	M	M	H
Waverly	M	M	H	M	M	L	M	L	H	L	M	M	Ma	L	H	H	M	M
Winchendon	TM	L	H	L	M	L	L	L	H	M	M	H	Ma/D	L	M	M	M	M
(10-25,000)																		
Atchison	M	L	H	L	M	M	H	H	L	H	L	L	D	L	L	L	L	H
Bath	CM	H	M	M	M	M	M	M	H	M	M	M	Ma	L	M	H	H	M
Brown Deer	CM	H	H	M	M	M	L	L	H	M	M	M	Ma	H	M	H	M	H
Cambridge	CM	H	H	M	H	M	H	L	L	H	L	L	Ma	L	M	H	M	H
Carthage	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	H	M	L	H	H	Ma	L	M	L	M	M
Carbondale	CM	H	H	M	M	M	H	M	M	L	L	H	Rd	H	M	L	M	L
Dunkirk	M	L	M	M	L	M	M	L	H	L	H	H	Ma	L	H	M	M	M
Martinsburg	M	M	H	L	M	M	L	L	M	M	H	H	Ma	H	M	M	M	H
Martins Ferry	CM	M	H	L	M	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	Ma	L	M	M	M	M
Robbins	M	M	L	H	M	M	L	L	H	L	H	L	Ma	H	M	L	M	M
Roseburg	CM	H	M	M	M	M	H	L	M	M	H	H	Ma	H	M	M	H	M
Seaside	CM	H	M	M	H	M	M	H	L	H	L	H	RrGD	L	L	L	M	L
Smyrna	M	M	M	M	L	M	H	M	L	H	L	L	Rr/D	L	M	H	M	L
Traverse City	CM	H	M	M	H	M	M	L	H	L	H	H	Mr	L	H	H	H	H
Trinidad	CM	M	H	M	L	M	L	L	H	M	M	H	RrMg	L	L	L	M	H
Winchester	M	L	L	H	M	M	H	H	H	M	M	M	Ma	L	H	M	M	H
(25-50,000)																		
Cypress	CM	H	H	H	H	H	H	L	L	H	L	L	Rr/D	L	M	H	M	H
Gastonia	CM	H	M	H	H	H	H	H	L	H	L	M	Ma	H	H	M	M	H
Lebanon	M	M	L	H	H	H	M	L	M	M	M	M	Ma	L	H	H	H	M
McAllen	CM	H	H	H	M	H	M	H	L	H	L	H	Rr	L	H	M	H	M
Middleton	M	M	H	M	H	H	L	M	M	L	H	M	Ma	L	H	H	H	H
N Las Vegas	CM	H	L	L	H	H	H	H	L	H	L	L	X/D	L	L	M	M	H
Tupelo	M	H	H	H	M	H	H	H	L	M	L	H	Ma	L	H	H	H	M
TOTALS	17CM	11L	10L	9L	11L	13L*	10L	17L	10L	12L	12L	7L		20L	6L	9L	1L	3L
	18M	12M	10M	18M	17M	16M	13M	9M	13M	12M	14M	9M			20M	16M	25M	19M
	12M	13H	16H	9H	8H	7H	13H	10H	13H	9H	10H	20H		9H	10H	11H	10H	14H

*Includes LL's

[1]Factor characterstics explained pp. 52-69.

BY FACTOR CHARACTERISTICS[1]

total economy	growth center	median family income	family income under $3,000		sound housing	housing built before 1939	value of housing	housing needs	housing effort	physical development	community facilities		public education system	school years completed	health	recreation and culture	community leadership		use of community	major needs	needs for outside assistance	federal program use
					PHYSICAL								SOCIAL									
M	L	L	H		L	M	L	M	L	L	M		L	L	L	L	L		H	H	M	M
L	L	L	H		M	M	L	M	L	L	M		M	L	L	L	L		M	H	M	M
M	L	H	M		M	H	H	M	L	L	M		M	M	L	L	M		H	M	M	L
M	L	L	H		L	H	L	M	L	L	L		M	M	L	L	L		H	H	H	M
M	L	L	H		M	H	L	M	L	L	L		M	L	L	L	L		H	H	H	L
L	L	L	H		M	H	L	M	M	M	L		L	M	L	L	L		H	H	H	H
M	L	M	M		H	H	H	M	H	H	M		M	H	M	M	L		H	M	H	H
M	L	M	M		M	H	L	H	L	L	L		M	M	L	L	L		H	H	H	L
M	H	M	L		H	M	H	L	L	M	M		M	H	M	M	M		H	H	H	M
H	H	M	M		H	M	M	M	M	H	H		H	H	M	M	H		H	L	L	H
L	L	H	L			H	L	H	L	L	M		H	M	L	L	L		H	H	H	L
M	H	H	L		H	M	L	L	M	H	M		M	H	M	M	M		H	L	L	M
M	L	M	M		H	H	M	H	M	L	L		L	M	L	M	L		M	H	H	L
L	L	L	M		L	L	M	H	M	M	L		M	L	L	L	M		M	H	H	L
M	L	M	M		L	H	L	H	H	H	H		H	H	M	M	M		H	L	L	H
M	H	M	L		H	H	M	M	M	M	M		H	H	M	M	M		H	L	L	M
H	L	H	L		H	L	H	L	H	L	L		H	H	H	M	M		L	L	L	L
M	L	L	H		L	H	L	M	L	L	M		L	L	L	L	M		H	H	H	M
M	H	H	M		M	H	M	M	H	H	L		M	H	M	M	M		H	H	H	L
M	L	M	M		L	H	L	H	L	L	M		M	L	L	L	M		H	H	M	H
M	H	H	L		H	L	H	M	L	M	M		M	H	H	H	M		H	M	M	M
L	L	L	M		H	L	M	M	H	H	H		M	M	M	L	H		L	M	M	H
M	L	H	L		H	L	H	L	L	M	M		M	H	M	M	L		H	L	L	L
H	H	H	L		M	H	L	H	L	L	M		H	M	H	H	M		H	L	L	M
L	L	L	H		L	H	L	H	M	M	L		L	L	H	L	L		H	H	H	H
M	H	L	H		L	H	L	H	M	L	M		M	L	M	M	L		H	M	M	H
H	L	H	L		H	L	H	L	L	H	H		H	H	M	M	H		L	L	L	L
M	H	M	M		L	M	L	H	M	M	H		M	L	H	H	M		H	L	L	H
H	H	M	L		M	H	L	H	H	M	H		M	M	M	M	M		H	M	M	M
H	H	L	H		L	L	M	H	L	M	H		M	L	H	H	M		M	L	L	M
H	H	H	L		M	H	H	H	H	M	M		M	M	M	H	M		H	M	M	H
M	L	H	L		H	L	H	M	H	H	M		M	M	M	M	H		L	M	H	H
H	H	M	H		L	M	H	M	H	H	M		H	H	H	H	H		H	M	M	H
6L	20L	12L	13L		10L	8L	13L	6L	15L	11L	9L		6L	11L	14L	12L	15L		4L	10L	10L	10L
22M		12M	13M		10M	8M	11M	16M	13M	15M	17M		22M	14M	13M	17M	16M		3M	11M	10M	11M
8H	16H	12H	10H		15H	20H	12H	14H	8H	10H	10H		8H	11H	9H	7H	5H		29H	15H	16H	15H

Form of government

There were three forms of government studied: Council-Manager (CM); Mayor (M); Town Meeting (TM). The 36 cities in the study group are nearly evenly divided between the number of cities operating under the mayor-council form (18), and those cities using the council-manager form (17). One city has the town meeting form.

Government organization and services

Government organization and services incorporate a wider range of city government elements and include the essential functions of providing major public services. These services include administrative, fire, police, street maintenance, garbage collection, building inspection, library, parks and recreation programs. This characteristic also encompasses the relative technical capability of the city's administrative staff; the type of the form of government used; and the relative stability of the policy-making body as measured by election characteristics, rate of political turnover, terms of office of the mayor and councilmen, and whether or not the terms of the city council members are overlapping. The overall rating reflects a combination of these factors. L is a low capability and performance as compared to a norm for the communities studied. M is a medium capability and performance, and H is a high capability and performance. In relating each of the 36 cities for the over-all effectiveness of its organization and services, 11 cities were assigned a low rating, 12 cities were given a medium rating, and 13 cities were found to merit a high rating.

Fiscal effort

The fiscal effort characteristic includes major factors that measure the relative effort of a community in obtaining revenue from local sources to finance public facilities, services, and other programs. These measurement factors are the local property tax burden on the owners of residential property, the city's utilization of local non-property tax sources of revenue, and the relation of the city's tax rate and general obligation bonded indebtedness to any limitations imposed by the state. Of the 36 cities in the study group, 15 were found to have state limitations on their tax rates, and 27 were found to have state limitations on their bonded indebtedness. The property tax burden is measured as a relation between the total current property tax bill of the owner of an average home and the average current annual family income. To determine property tax burden, a high rating was assigned when a current total property tax bill for a current medium value home was found to be five or more percent of a current medium value for family income. Similarly a low rating was assigned when a current total property tax bill for a medium value home was found to be three percent or less of a current medium value for family income.

In determining the rating of each city for "fiscal effort", consideration was given not only to its tax burden rating, but also to the tax limitations imposed by the state and the utilization of other local revenues. For example, one city has a very low property tax burden, but was assigned a high "fiscal effort" rating. This city is subjected to very low tax limitations imposed by the state, and the city tax rate is at the state limit. From a tax rate standpoint, this city is making a

maximum fiscal effort. Further fiscal effort by this city is reflected by its high utilization of business licenses and special service fees.

Of the 36 cities in the study group, 16 cities were found to be making unusually good fiscal efforts and were therefore assigned a high rating. Ten cities were assigned a "medium" rating, and 10 other cities were assigned a "low" rating.

Fiscal capacity

This characteristic refers to the ability of a city to increase its financing of city services and programs beyond current levels. To measure this ability, consideration was given to the present fiscal effort, to the city's unused general obligation bonding capacity, and to any anticipated major increases of revenue such as the probable continued rapid growth of the property tax base and/or new revenue from shared nonproperty taxes. For many of the cities that are now making a high fiscal effort, their capacity to increase present levels of revenue is very low and they were assigned a "low" rating. In these cases, the city's taxpayers have a heavy tax burden (which includes taxes for the city, schools, county, etc.), new bond issue proposals are apt to be defeated, the property tax base is not increasing, and there are no new revenues from the state or other sources.

On the other hand, most of the cities that are making a low fiscal effort have a relatively high capacity to increase present levels of revenue. Their city tax rates are well below state limitations, the total property tax burden is low, and they have relatively large unused bonding capacity.

A few cities have a high fiscal effort, but also have a high capacity to increase their financing of city services and programs due to rapid growth of their property tax base, and/or new outside sources of major revenue other than property taxes. For all 36 cities in the study group, many variations and combinations were found that differ from the foregoing examples. In the rating system a low (L) rating signifies a poor fiscal capacity to achieve higher funding levels. M is a medium capacity, and H indicates a high capacity. For the cities in the study group, nine cities were assigned a "low" fiscal capacity rating, 18 cities were given a "medium" rating and the nine others were given a "high" rating.

Planning

This characteristic reflects a combination of a community's planning organization, staffing and activities. Planning activities not only include the preparation and adoption of a comprehensive plan, but also the adoption of planning codes, a long range capital improvement program, and special planning studies such as for neighborhood analysis, urban renewal, housing, recreation, etc. The rating does not encompass planning at the regional level. A (L) rating signifies poor or inadequate planning; (M) rating indicates a medium level of planning and (H) rating is a high level of planning. After evaluating the over-all quality and effectiveness of the planning activities in each city, only eight cities were found to stand out sufficiently above the norm of the group to merit a "high" rating. Seventeen cities were assigned a "medium" rating, and the planning activities of 11 cities were so clearly inadequate that they were assigned a "low" rating.

Population size

The 36 communities in the sample were divided into four population categories defined as follows. LL=under 5,000; L=5,000–9,999; M=10,000–24,999; H=25,000–49,000. In the sample there were 6, 17, 16, and 7 cities in each of these size categories respectively.

Percent of population growth

This characteristic shows the rate of growth of each of the cities since 1960. The communities were classified according to the following indicators: L=under 7%; M=7–19%; H=20% and over. Of the 36 communities studied 13 had experienced a "high" rate of growth while 10 showed a growth in population of under 7%.

Percent minority population

The ranking for the percentage of minority population in a community were as follows: A low rating (L) was given if the percentage of minority to total population was under 5 percent. If that percentage fell between 5 and 15 percent a medium (M) rating was applied. Those communities with over 15 percent received a high (H) rating. In the 36 communities covered by the general study there were 17 cities with less than 5 percent minority population, 9 with between 5 and 15 percent, and 10 with over 15 percent minority population.

Percent elderly population

The rankings for the percent of the elderly population (defined as persons over age 65) in the community were: L=under 8%; M=8–12%; and H=over 12%. As defined, the distribution of the sample communities showed 10 with a low elderly ratio, 13 with a medium ratio, and 13 cities with a ratio of over 15% of the population made up of individuals over 65.

Percent population under 18

This indicator was subdivided in the following manner: L=under 32%; M=32–37%; H=over 37%. Of the 36 cities in the study group, 12 cities have a low proportion of children as compared to a norm for the study group as a whole and were therefore assigned a low rating. Twelve other cities were found to be near the norm and were accordingly assigned a medium rating. Nine cities have a relatively high proportion of children and were assigned a high rating.

Medium age

The medium age of the population was classified according to the following ranking: L=under 29 years of age; M=29–33 years: and H=over 33 years. The distribution within the sample cities of this characteristic for each of the above categories was 12, 14 and 10 cities, respectively.

Location

The 36 cities were divided into three types of location: Independent cities which are isolated from a nearby large city or urbanized area. All cities located over 30 miles from a city 50,000 or more in population are designated as independent (H). Satellite cities which are located within 30 miles (commuting distance) of a city of more than 50,000 but not within an SMSA are shown by the letter (M). Cities within

an SMSA are shown by the letter (L). Within the sample group there were 20 independent cities, nine satellite communities and seven cities located within an SMSA.

Economic classification

The economic classification used to describe the sample cities was described in the preceding section on the design of the profile, but are listed here for purposes of convenience. Abbreviations are shown in parentheses.

Manufacturing (Mm)
Diversified–Manufacturing (Mr)
Diversified–Retailing (Rm)
Retailing (Rr)
Dormitory (D)
Mining (mg)
Resort (X)
Government (G)
Education (ED)

Industrial concentration

All cities in the sample were ranked according to whether or not they had a high degree of industrial concentration. Cities with low industrial concentration (L) reflected a high diversification of industry with no one type of industry or major firm being dominant. A (H) ranking indicates the presence of low-diversification and dominance of a firm or industry. Within the sample group nine communities reflected a relatively high degree of industrial concentration.

Industry and commerce

The overall rating reflects a combined rating of factors that include the diversity, the past growth and the potential for growth of the community's industry and commerce, as well as factors relating to chamber of commerce activitiy, including industrial development efforts. A low (L) rating signifies an overall and significant low degree of the factors enumerated as related to the norm of those communities in the study group. An M rating reflects a medium degree, and a high (H) rating indicates a relatively high degree of presence of the above characteristics. In terms of the sample, the distribution of low, medium, and high ratings for industry and commerce was 6, 20, and 10, respectively.

Employment

This characteristic reflects a combined rating of such factors as the matching-up of jobs in the community with the employable residents in the community. This rating took into account the skill level of the labor force, the unemployment rate, the level of education achieved, and the approximate number of resident employables working outside of the city. A low (L) rating indicates a significantly undersirable employment situation as related to the norm of the communities in the study group. An (M) rating signifies an average employment situation, and a high (H) rating means an exceptionally desirable employment situation was present. In the communities visited, this desirable situation was reflected in 11 communities. Nine cities were ranked low and 16 average for this characteristic.

Banking

The assignment of an overall rating to each community for this characteristic was very difficult. A low (L) rating was assigned to

only one community, and only because there were no banks located in that community. However 10 communities were assigned a high (H) rating which was essentially based upon a clear indication that the banks in those community served their banking needs exceptionally well as compared to the norm of the communities in the study group.

Transportation

The rating of this characteristic reflects a combined evaluation of air, rail, and highway transportation facilities and services for both goods and passengers both for intra-city and inter-city. A low (L) rating signifies poor transportation efficiencies as compared to a norm for the communities in the study group. All the communities to which this rating was applied reflected servere problems in their intra-city facilities and service. A medium rating (M) reflected an average level of facilities and services and was applied to 19 cities. Fourteen cities were judged high (H) because of their exceptionally good transportation factors as compared to a norm for the study group as a whole.

Total economy

This overall "economic" rating reflects a combination of all the separate ratings for the four foregoing economic characteristics. In arriving at this index emphasis was placed on the industry and commerce and employment characteristics relative to the others mentioned. For the sample of 36 communities, a total of 22 were rated as having an average overall economic base and potential for growth. Eight of the communities were rated high and in general possessed all the essential criteria for a viable economy as well as excellent growth potential. Six communities were felt to be quite economically depressed relative to the sample average and were given a low rating.

Growth center

A rating was made accordin[illegible] whether or not the community under evaluation was a growth [illegible]nter. Sixteen of the communities in the sample were serving as the principal center for the region's economic activity and are indicated by an (H). A lack of serving as the focal point of the economy of the surrounding area was evidenced by 20 cities as indicated by the (L) rating.

Median family income

This characteristic was ranked under the following groups: L=under $4,600; M=$4,600–5,400; H=above $5,400. Of the cities in the study group, 12 have a low median income as defined above; 12 others have a median income which is approximately the average for the sample and were given accordingly a medium rating while 12 cities were given a high ranking indicating a relatively high median family income.

Family income under $3,000

Ratings of the percentage of families with incomes under $3,000 were grouped as follows: L=under 19%; M=19–30%; H=over 30%. The distribution of these categories among the sample communities was 13, 13 and 10, respectively.

Sound housing

The ratings for the percent of sound housing were determined in the following way: L=under 70%; M=70–80%; H=above 80%. Of the communities studied 10 were in the first category, 10 in the second and 15 were found to have over 80% of their dwelling units in sound condition.

Housing built before 1939

This factor, reflecting the relative age of dwellings in a community shows the percent of housing units built prior to 1939. The rankings by category are: L=under 50%; M=50-65%; H=above 65%. Eight communities fell within each of the first two categories while 20 of the 36 communities contained over 65% dwelling units which had been built since 1939.

Value of housing

This characteristic reflects median home value and was ranked in the following manner: L=under $8,500; M=$8,500–11,000; H=above $11,000. The distribution of the value of housing by these categories was 13, 11 and 12 respectively for the communities included in the survey.

Housing needs

The "housing need" characteristic encompasses the age of the community's private housing as reflected by the percent of sound housing as of 1960 (or more recently, if available), the number of new residential units built in the last five years, the percent of family income under $3,000, the median family income, the number of public housing units provided, the public housing current waiting list, and the relative concentration of substandard housing in minority neighborhoods.

A large number of cities (a total of 14) were found to have housing needs that were obviously of a much larger magnitude than those of the other 36 cities in the study group. These 14 cities were assigned a "high" (H) rating. Conversely, only six cities were found to have exceptionally small housing needs, and were assigned a "low" rating (L). The remaining 16 cities were given a "medium" (M) rating, since their housing needs were not exceptionally large or small.

Housing effort

The "housing effort" characteristic refers to a community's efforts and achievements to improve housing conditions in relation to its housing needs. To determine the relative status of housing efforts in a given community, an evaluation was made of efforts in providing housing for low and moderate income families, housing for the elderly, residential urban renewal projects, and the enforcement of housing codes. In those communities having a relative large minority population, particular attention and consideration was given to the efforts made in providing for the housing needs of minority groups.

For the 36 cities in the study group, only eight were assigned a "high" (H) rating for housing effort, which reflects exceptionally good efforts

to improve over-all housing conditions; 13 cities were given a "medium" (M) rating, and 15 cities (42% of the entire study group) were assigned a "low" (L) rating.

Physical development

The physical development characteristic refers to the relative adequacy of the community's physical development and the community's efforts to made needed improvements. Communities were assigned a "high" rating for this characteristic if the present physical development was found to be exceptionally good in comparison with the norm for the study group. In addition, if a community was found to have a relatively poor development, but was making exceptional efforts to improve its development, it was also assigned a "high" rating. In effect, equal ratings are given to "completion" and to "substantial progress."

In designing the physical development characteristic, the following major elements were included, and in each case encompass the city's relative needs as well as the city's activities in alleviating these needs: availability of sites for industrial, commercial and residential facilities, including annexation; implementation of a comprehensive plan; enforcement of zoning and subdivision regulations; and urban renewal programs for the central business district and other areas.

In rating the cities, 11 were given a "low" (L) rating, 15 cities were assigned a "medium" (M) rating, and 10 cities were found to merit a "high" (H) rating.

Community facilities

The community facilities characteristic relates to the present adequacy of physical facilities that are essential for providing major public services. In designing this characteristic and in rating the communities, 15 types of physical facilities have been included, and are identified as follows:

The city hall, police stations, fire stations, the street system, off-street parking in business areas, waste disposal sites and/or incinerator, public library, system of parks and playgrounds, water supply system, water distribution system, sanitary sewage collection system, sewage treatment plant, storm sewer system and health facilities.

The adequacy of these facilities depends upon several types of measurements. For buildings, important considerations for determining adequacy are space, layout, and quality of construction; fire stations would also include their location pattern; street systems include traffic circulation patterns, the quality and width of travel surfaces, and general appearance; for parks and playgrounds, their size, number and location patterns are critical factors; and for utility systems such as water and sewer, principal considerations are their size, the quality of their product, and the degree to which they serve all areas of the city.

As might be expected, no community in the study group was found to have *all* of its community facilities in an adequate condition or in an inadequate condition. Among the 36 cities there were sufficient variances to allow their separation into a "low", "medium", and "high" group without undue difficulty. As with most of the other characteristics, the ratings are in relation to the norm for the group as a whole. Nine cities were assigned a "L" (poor) rating, 17 others were given a "M" rating and 10 cities were found to merit a "H" (good) rating.

Public education system

The education characteristic refers to the quality of a community's public school system. The following aspects of a public school system are covered: the adequacy of the school facilities; relative needs and provisions for vocational and adult education; student drop-out rates; the proportion of high school graduates going on to college, and the over-all quality of the public school system as compared to a norm for the study group of communities as a whole.

In rating the cities for education, six cities were assigned a "L" (poor) rating, 22 cities were given a "M" rating, and eight cities were found to merit a "H" (good) rating.

School years completed

The characteristic for median numbers of years of school completed by adult residents of the community over 25 years of age was grouped as follows: L=under 9.5 years; M=9.5–11.0 years; H=over 11 years. The sample communities reflected a fairly even distribution for these three categories. Eleven communities were rated "L", 14 were rated "M" and 11 communities were rated "H".

Health

The health characteristic refers to a community's services and facilities for providing public health services and medical care. Public health services and facilities were evaluated on the basis of several factors considered to have direct effect on a community's total public health delivery system. Major factors included the adoption and implementation of a public health code, the supervision and staffing of a local public health agency; provisions for environmental regulations and control (inspections of food establishments, etc.); availability of health clinics; and provision for home health services.

Medical care services and facilities were evaluated on the basis of such factors as the availability and general quality of hospitals, doctors and dentists, mental health centers, homes for the indigent, nursing homes, extended care facilities, orphanages, and specialized facilities for chronic diseases.

The ratings for the health characteristic reflect combined ratings for public health and medical care factors. Fourteen cities were assigned a "L" (poor) rating, 13 cities were given a "M" rating, and nine cities were found to merit a "H" (good) rating.

Recreation and culture

The over-all rating reflects a combined ranking of park and recreation facilities, supervised recreation programs, public library facilities and programs, as well as cultural activities and offerings such as community concerts, drama, lectures, and art exhibits. The rating for each community is only in relation to the norm of those communities in the study group. A high (H) rating assigned to 7 communities signifies a good recreation and cultural environment. A low (L) rating was given to 12 communities and signifies an exceptionally poor level of recreation and cultural offerings as compared to a norm for the communities in the study group. A medium (M) rating was given to 17 communities.

Community leadership and citizen involvement

The over-all rating reflects a combined ranking of the relative effectiveness of a community's leadership, citizen participation, citizen support, and citizen attitudes in working toward an achievement of programs needed to improve the quality of life in the community. For each community, the rating is in relation to the norm of the communities in the study group.

A low (L) rating signifies poor effective leadership and citizen participation. Fifteen of the cities were rated in the category. Five communities were ranked as high (H) signifying exceptionally good presence of all these factors.

Age of community

Twenty-nine of the communities studied were incorporated before 1900 and are designated by the symbol (H). An (M) designates the three communities that were incorporated between 1900 and 1945. The four communities in the sample incorporated since 1945 are designated by (L).

Major community needs

The over-all rating of community needs reflects an assessment of major needs regardless of type. A low (L) rating signifies little need in relation to a norm for the communities in the study group. Ten communities were placed in this group. A high (H) rating, given to 15 communities, indicates exceptionally large needs. The remaining 11 communities were given an (M) rating which indicates that they were near the average.

Needs for outside assistance

The over-all rating reflects a combination of other ratings for the given community, including its fiscal capability and its needs. Ten cities in the sample demonstrated little need for outside assistance and were rated (L). Another 10 cities were considered to have average needs (M) for outside program assistance. The cities felt to be in greatest need for Federal and/or state assistance were rated (H). Sixteen communities were placed in this high need category.

Federal program use

This rating is based on the number of Federal programs as well as the per capita dollar value of all such programs used by a community. Those communities making little use of Federal assistance in relation to the norm for the communities in the study group were ranked "low." Ten cities were placed in this category. Eleven cities were ranked average (M) with regard to the use of Federal program assistance and 15 cities had made extensive use of Federal assistance as evidenced by the (H) rating.

TABLE III–2 A CLASSIFICATION MATRIX MODEL FOR SMALL COMMUNITIES

CHARACTERISTICS	Good Organization & Services	Good Fiscal Effort	High Fiscal Capacity	Good Planning	Good Industry & Commerce	Good Employment	Good Transportation	Low Housing Needs	High Housing Effort	Good Physical Development	Good Community Facilities	Good Education System	Good Recreation Facilities	Good Health Facilities	Good Community Leadership and Citizen Involvement
Form of Government	C–M			C–M						C–M	C–M	C–M		C–M	C–M
Government Organization & Service		(+)		(+)	+	+		+	+	(+)	(+)	+	+	+	(+)
Fiscal Effort	(+)		(–)							(+)		(+)	(+)	(+)	
Fiscal Capacity		(–)			+						+				
Planning	(+)				(+)	+	+		(+)	(+)	(+)	+	(+)	+	(+)
Population Size	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	+		–	(+)	(+)	(+)		(+)	(+)	+
Percent Population Growth			(+)	+				(+)							(+)
Percent Minority Population								(–)	+						
Percent Elderly Population								(–)		–					(–)
Percent Population Under 18												+			
Median Age	–			–	+					–	–	–			(–)
Location				METRO			METRO				METRO				
Total Economic Rating	(+)	+	(+)	(+)	+	+	+	+	+	(+)	(+)	(+)		(+)	+
Growth Center					+	+					(+)		+	+	(+)
Medium Family Income		(+)				(+)		(+)		(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	
Family Income Under $3,000		(–)		(–)		(–)		(–)		(–)	(–)	(–)	(–)	(–)	
Sound Housing	(+)	+	(–)					(+)		(+)		+			
Housing Built Before '39	–		–	–				(–)	+	(–)	(–)			–	
Value of Housing	(+)	(+)						(+)	+	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	+
Housing Needs										–					
Housing Effort				(+)						(+)					(+)
Physical Development		(+)	+	(+)		+		(+)	(+)		(+)	+	(+)	+	(+)
Community Facilities					(+)	+									(+)
Public Education System	+				+	(+)	+			+	+		+	+	(+)
School Years Completed	(+)	+				(+)		+		+		(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
Health	+						+			+	+	+	+		
Recreation & Culture	(+)				(+)					+	(+)			+	(+)
Community Leadership and Involvement	(+)			(+)		+	+		(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	+	
Age of Community				(–)	+		–	(–)							–
Major Needs	–	–		–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
Needs for Outside Assistance	–		–	–	–	–	–	–		–	–	–	–	–	
Federal Program Use	+		+	+				–	+	+	+		+	+	+

Metro = SMSA or Satellite City
\+ = Positive relationship
– = Negative relationship
( ) = Key relationship
= Cells without observations indicate no significant relationship

A CLASSIFICATION MODEL FOR SMALL COMMUNITIES

Having defined and ranked these key community characteristics it is possible to develop a classification model to be used in small community analysis. A schematic presentation of the model is shown by the matrix of Table III–2. In the left hand column 32 of the 38 key characteristics are listed. Of the six parameters excluded five are incorporated in the total economic rating and the sixth, economic classification, is not being analyzed further because the number of definitial categories is very high in relation to the number of cities in the sample. The 15 headings across the top of the matirx incorporate the principal elements of the small community profile. These elements have all been defined to describe conditions which would be optimal from the community's viewpoint and from the perspective of HUD if it were considering program assistance to a community.

By employing factor analysis this matrix indicates which indicators (characteristics) of the community environment are most able to provide on *a priori* bases those conditions which it is felt are of the greatest importance in studying the environment of the small community. The key relationships are shown as being either positive (+) or nagative (−) in each cell. The weighting that is placed on some of these relationships as well as a discussion of the key interrelationships that were found to exist is presented below. A brief discussion is also presented on the particular methodology and on the factor analysis underlying the matrix.

The analytic approach to determine the key relationships among the characteristics consists of comparing the distribution of any one of the 37 characteristics with the distribution of each of the other 36; this process being repeated for all 37 parameters. For illustrative purposes an example showing the distribution of the population characteristic with that for planning is shown in Figure III–1. (It should be remembered that planning is only one of 36 characteristics being related to population in the particular exercise from which this example is taken.) At the top of the figure the figures and percentage breakdowns for the distribution of population in the high, medium and low categories is shown. Below these figures are shown the breakdown of the observations in each of these three population category cells, by this breakdown according to the characteristic of planning. Of the 13 cities that were rated low in terms of population, eight were rated low in terms of their planning capacity and five were rated as having a medium capacity. A similar analysis can be made for the 16 cities of medium size and the seven large cities.

There are any number of ways to express the conclusions which can be shown from this particular sample, since there are two ways of stating each relationship. It can be concluded that of the cities in the sample which were small, eight of the 13 had poor planning. Looked at in a slightly different way, of the 11 cities which had low planning, 72% were found to be small communities of less than 10,00. While the implications of these two conclusions are slightly different, the overall relationship between planning capacity and size of city is quite evident. That is, there is clearly a positive relationship between the size of a city and its planning capacity.

FIG. III-1.—A SAMPLE CROSS CHARACTERISTIC ANALYSIS; PLANNING CAPABILITY BY POPULATION

	Low	Medium	High
Population:			
Number	13	16	7
Percent	[1] 36	44	19
Planning capability:			
Number	8	3	----------
Percent	72	28	----------
Number	5	10	2
Percent	29	58	13
Number	----------	3	5
Percent	----------	37	63

[1] Percentage figures only have meaning in terms of low distribution.

This conclusion along with a number of others which the study team feels are significant are represented by the observations in the cells of the matrix of table III–2.

The relationships which were identified from the application of the model are identified by the cell observations of that matrix. Those that are felt to be key relationships are placed in parentheses.

It is clear that many of the indicators identified signify no relationship but merely reflect coincident behavior.

The key relationships identified provide the basis for many of the conclusions and recommendations developed in the two following sections of the report. The frequency of observation of these relationships in the communities leads to the conclusion that when analyzing the small community environment these are the characteristics which provide meaningful insight.

More specifically, from the point of view of HUD program delivery, the model indiates that if HUD can count on bringing about some positive impact in the environment by operating in areas identified by the community characteristics, it will have a predictable impact on the profile element areas of "good planning", "good organization and services", etc. The model therefore, not only provides a meaningful vehicle to evaluate the small community environment, but also casts considerable light on the myriad of relationships affecting the successful delivery of HUD program assistance to these communities.

Section IV. Small Community Needs and Problems

An analysis of small community needs and problems forms the second major element in this study. A major objective of the study has been to identify the governmental, economical, physical, and social needs of small communities in order to establish the bases for recommendations for adapting or developing HUD and other Federal programs to effectively meet such needs.

There are several limitations in describing the needs and problems of communities which should be stated at the outset. First, the use of a small selected sample precludes a direct projection of the results in terms of the problems and needs of small communities nationally. As has been pointed out previously in the discussion on the classification of small communities, the results should be subjected to a larger statistically significant sample. However, the needs and problems identified do fit into a pattern of requirements which have been identi-

fied in other work by the study team and by others. It is, therefore, with a high degree of assurance that these results are reported.

Second, the mere presence of a need does not automatically constitute a requirement for a solution based upon outside assistance, whether Federal or state. Each community must be viewed individually. There is no question but that the solution of certain surface needs may only lead to the prolongation of basic problems. The solutions to the needs and problems of some small communities may lie completely outside of the province of Federal assistance. Basic community viability, community leadership, citizen involvement and interest are all matters which must be determined first and should involve state, regional and local determinations. This will involve the application of community study techniques similar to the small community profile methodology used in this study. For this reason, great stress is placed upon comprehensive planning in the recommedations which follow, the evaluation of Federal Programs.

In the discussions which follow, the needs and problems of small communities are viewed from several different aspects. First, the needs of small communities are identified from a programmatic point of view; that is, the needs which have been evidenced from a study of the four basic sectors—governmental, economic, physical, and social, are described. It is within these terms that community needs are most often considered. Second, as part of the analysis of community needs and problems, a special look is taken at the perceptions of such problems by the minority community and how they may differ from the perceptions of the community's leadership.[1] Third, having made an analysis of needs and problems, a study is made of a second important ingredient in small community development—citizen leadership and involvement. Without such involvement, the translation of needs into programs for progress will not occur.

After an analysis of community needs and problems and the local interest in their solution, the report turns to the requirements for outside assistance to further small community growh and development. The requirements for outside assistance and the current relationships between small communities and other levels of government are discussed. Finally the specific use of Federal programs by the small communities visited and their reported experiences in using Federal programs are described.

MAJOR SMALL COMMUNITY PROGRAM SECTOR NEEDS

The small community problems and needs discussed below are those that were identified during field visits to the 36 communities in the study group, and are considered to be of relative importance in affecting the quality of urban life and the use of Federal programs. The needs rather than the problems are emphasized, since in most cases the attendant problems are evidenced by the types of the needs. Furthermore, needs rather than problems correlate more closely with assistance programs. The four major program sectors—governmental, economic, physical, and social—serve as the most appropriate framework for grouping types of small community needs.

[1] An analysis of minority community needs and problems is contained in a separate substudy prepared by Roy Littlejohn and Associates.

Government

The structure, capability, and performance of local governments are of major importance in shaping the quality of life of their residents. The government not only provides public services and facilities essential to the life of the community, but also formulates and implements programs and regulations that directly affect the quality of all other major sectors of community life—economic, physical, and social. In most incorporated communities, the city government not only has more power (general police or regulatory power) and more social responsibility than any other organization, public or private, but is also larger and more complex.

The needs of small communities relative to the government sector are discussed below. The characteristics analyzed are government organization and services, public finance and community planning.

The *need for a full-time professional city administrator* was recognized by leaders in only four communities visited although the study team considered this to be a need in eight other communities. The 36 communities in the study group are nearly evenly divided between the number of cities operating under the mayor-council form (18 cities), and those cities using the council-manager form (17 cities). One city has the town-meeting form. The small communities visited had approximately the same proportion between 5,000 and 50,000 population using the council-manager form as there are in the United States as a whole. One third of the communities under 5,000 population in the study group have the council-manager form of government. For the United States, less than 10 percent of cities under 5,000 population use the council-manager form.

In analyzing the study results it was found that in comparison with the mayor-council cities, the council-manager group of cities contains a much larger proportion of cities having a high level of organization and services, more effective planning, more adequate over-all physical development, higher adequacy of public facilities, and a smaller number of major needs, and needs for outside assistance. Since the quality of planning and services may be essentially a factor of population size only, an analysis of communities over 10,000 population was also made. This analysis produced the same results as the first. The need for professional administration, either through the council-manager form of government or one of the alternative plans available such as an administrative officer is essential for small community development.

A *need to provide more adequate municipal services* was found in most of the small communities, but there were many variances in types and numbers of services that were considered to be clearly inadequate. Need for improvements in code enforcement inspections and in supervised recreation programs were the most numerous—in 20 communities, or a little over one-half of the study group and spread rather evenly in all population groups. In most of these cities, the officials did not report a need to improve code enforcement, but did point out a need to improve recreation. These findings would tend to indicate that small communities either do not consider code enforcement as being important or else are reluctant to push a program with such obvious sensitivity.

Needs to correct inadequacies of five other major services were found in approximately one-fourth of the communities, although not all were found in each community. These are fire, police, street maintenance, garbage collection, and library services. They represent needs that are most heavily concentrated in the communities under 5,000 population. The inadequacy of these services often stems from inadequate fiscal capacity.

A *need to improve fiscal capacity is particularly important* in nine of the communities, and is caused by several major problems that are difficult to surmount. Among these are state laws that severely limit a community's tax rate and/or incurrence of bonded indebtedness, a lack of state collected revenues shared with local communities, a low valuation of tax assessable property per capita, and high costs of major services such as the public schools. However, most of these communities should make a greater effort to more fully utilize available revenue sources of a non-property tax nature within the community itself—such as special service charges, business licenses, and utility fees.

A large number of the 36 communities have a capability to raise more revenue and need to make greater effort to obtain more revenue from within the community, not only from licenses and fees, but from the property tax. Twenty-seven communities were found to have significant unused sources of revenue. These additional revenue possibilities included low tax rates that could be increased without reaching legal limitations, unused bonding power, small charges for sewer services and business licenses and for other special services that have not been increased for many years, and the use of new types of service fees. In some communities, for example, there are no fees for the use of the sewage system, for the collection of refuse, or for the licensing of business establishments. The increase of tax rates and special fees as well as the imposition of new type of charges are subject to consideration controversy, and are understandably avoided in many communities. However, the leadership and citizens of many small communities need to realize that the quality of community services and facilities are essential to the quality of urban life. To achieve and maintain this quality, a community must recognize its responsibility to make every reasonable effort to help itself.

A *major need to improve the effectiveness of city planning* was found in 11 communities of the 36 cities in the study group, 30 cities have active planning commissions, including four communities which have joint county-city planning commissions. However, only 10 cities have a full-time professional staff. Most of the other 26 cities utilize planning consultants, and many of the cities having full-time planners use planning consultants for the preparation of comprehensive plans and other major planning studies.

Thirty-one of the 36 communities have a comprehensive plan, but four cities reported that their comprehensive plans are too outdated for any practical use. Many cities have not implemented their plans to any appreciable extent, and some indicated that the comprehensive plan was authorized and prepared merely as a requirement for Federal program eligibility. Only 12 of the 36 communities have prepared

and adopted a multi-year (usually five year) capital improvement program. However, many of the 36 cities have had special surveys and planning studies for specific problems and programs. Some of the more prevalent studies have been for neighborhood analysis, urban renewal, housing conditions and needs, parks and recreation, and utilities.

Other important elements of planning are the preparation, adoption and updating of codes that serve to regulate and to set standards for the development and maintenance of land and structures, both public and private. Twenty-two of the 36 cities have all the types of codes required by HUD's workable program—building, electrical, plumbing, and housing. A very few cities also have architectural control regulations. Although every city has unsound housing (in varying degrees) nine of the 36 cities have yet to adopt a housing code, and eight cities lack one or more of the other codes listed in the workable program requirements.

In view of the relative small population size of the communities in the study group (only seven with more than 25,000 population) it was somewhat impressive to find such a large majority that have comprehensive plans. But after evaluating the over-all quality and effectiveness of the planning activities in each community, only eight cities were found to stand out sufficiently above the norm of the group to merit a high rating. Seventeen cities were assigned a medium rating, and the planning activities of 11 cities were so clearly inadequate that they were assigned a low rating. As with most other needs, financial limitations appear to account for poor planning efforts—particularly the inability to finance the cost of an adequate planning staff.

In other cases, the small population size of a community is an underlying problem due to the relative small planning workload involved which does not justify a full-time planning staff. Part-time planning assistance or consultants are often not available to a small community. Particularly in very small communities there is a major need to try to overcome this problem through cooperative arrangements with other units of government such as the county or nearby cities.

Aside from financial and staffing problems, more than a few of the communities in the study group have a concurrent need to develop more interest and appreciation of the importance and usefulness of city planning. In those communities which were evaluated as having a major need for planning improvement, practically no local officials or citizens recognized it as a major need. Yet the analysis of community characteristics reveals a strong relationship between good planning and such physical attributes of a city as good community facilities and desirable physical development.

The *need to implement a comprehensive plan* applies to one-half of the 36 communities. The implementation of the comprehensive plan is taken in a broad context. It includes the enforcement of zoning and subdivision regulations as well as the complete orderly development of the city as contained in the plan and by the necessary requirements for adjusting the plan over a period of time. The implementation of a comprehensive plan involves not only a coordination of the development of community facilities such as streets, parks, and schools, but also includes many facets of the private sector such as those related to

commercial, industrial, and privately owned transportation facilities. For the proper physical development of a city, full recognition must be given to the inter-relationship of all the separate elements in the community as described and delineated in the comprehensive plan. In spite of the importance of implementing the comprehensive plan, the study team encountered very few officials and other leaders in small communities who mentioned this as one of their community needs.

Economic

The analysis of the economic sector of the 36 communities visited was largely concerned with describing the environment and defining the context within which the evaluations of needs and problems in the other sectors could be carried on. A general description of the economic needs and problems of small communities would carry the discussion to areas which do not fall within the purview of this study.

A large number of people interviewed cited the need for more industry and jobs. While the identification of a need for more industry and jobs might be just another way of describing the relationship between economic development and community size, a number of specific needs in the areas of industrial development, employment, transportation, and banking were frequently observed and evaluated. Economic needs relevant to this study are discussed below.

A *need to more realistically view industrial development potential* was found to be a major need in many of the communities studied. Many examples were seen in which a significant amount of community resources had been used to develop industrial parks and/or building shells which would make the community more attractive to prospective industry. In a number of cases the fiscal capacity of the community had been considerably reduced because of these undertakings. While much of the organized industrial development activity that was observed has produced tangible results, and in a few cases has provided the principal stimulus to community revitalization, in far too many cases the efforts have been a big disappointment to the community. Typical patterns observed repeatedly were of the following nature. Resources were concentrated on one physical building and the success of the process depended totally on the firm which moved in. As a general rule, firms which are interested principally because of the provision of a building and other amenities, tax considerations etc. by the community, tend not to be the most viable economic entities, and therefore bring considable risk to the development effort.

Should the enterprise fail, the atmosphere for realistic industrial growth and development in the community may have suffered a serious setback. Communities generally wanted "clean, light" industry giving little thought to any economic reasons why this should be the case. What needs to be emphasized is the fact that just because a city has undertaken the development of an industrial park or other infrastructure facility is no guarantee that firms will automatically come in. In effect, what this process does is upgrade the communuity's position to a point where it is now in competition with hundreds of other communities who are in the same boat.

There exists a need to increase the provision of vocational training, on the job training and adult education programs. This portion of the education spectrum was found to be grossly deficient in nearly all com-

munities visited. The rapid technological changes in today's economy have made the traditional manual training courses totally inadequate. While the development of regional vocational schools is taking place at a rapid rate, far too many of the communities visited were still heavily dependent on the traditional curriculum.

The need to make available greater risk capital for business and funds to support the housing market is a universal problem. Local banks in small communities do not have the fiscal capacity to meet these needs and the branch banks of the larger institutions tend to be conservative in their meeting of requirements in these areas. The condition of tight money which existed during our investigation understandably aggravated these conditions.

A *need to improve intra-city transportation services and facilities* exists in a number of communities studied. In communities where employment is largely found outside the city limits this is an especially critical problem. The relative viability of the CBD versus outlying shopping centers is also being critically influenced by the provision or lack thereof of adequate intra-city transportation services.

A *need to renovate or modernize the city's central business district* was found to be a major need in 22 of the 36 communities, and was pointed out as a need by the leaders of nearly all these communities. The importance to a community of an adequate and attractive central business district relates to many facets of the quality of urban life and it is deemed to be worthwhile to mention a few of them. In many small communities, retail services are a large part of the economy and are in competition with the retail services of other communities. Also, the central business district is usually a principal focal point and symbol of the community. As such it has a major influence on the total evaluation or image of the community by its residents and visitors, which in turn affects the city's growth and total development. Another facet relates to how well a central business district serves the needs including the general convenience of its residents and visitors. The type, number, and quality of retail stores and other facilities, including traffic circulation and parking, are vital considerations in whether or not the public will go out of its way to patronize outlying shopping centers or even travel to other cities.

Physical

The physical sector of this study refers to a community's physical environment and condition. The relative adequacy of these factors and the efforts of the city's government to move forward toward their needed improvement are of principal concern. Three factors have been used to measure the needs of communities. They are physical development, housing and community facilities.

A *need for annexation* was found to be important in one-half of the 36 communities. This does not always arise from the same set of problems. In a majority of the communities, annexation needs arise from problems of contiguous fringe areas that are already populated but have substandard development, facilities, and services. In other cases, there is a need to annex territory that is not developed in order to prevent undesirable fringe development in the future as well as to provide suitable sites for the further development of the community

which has good potential growth but has few sites remaining inside the city to meet the land requirements for future growth.

It is generally accepted that there is a *need for more adequate housing* in nearly every urban place in the United States. However, for the purposes of this study, the housing needs of each community in the study group were evaluated in terms of the degree of need in relation to a norm for the study group as a whole. On this basis, 14 of the 36 cities were found to have a major need for more adequate housing. These are communities that are particularly afflicted with high percentages of substandard housing, low income families, and low rates of new private and/or public housing units.

A large number of officials in these communities recognized housing as a major problem, but the study team found many officials of small communities who were not particularly concerned with the housing needs of low income families. Based on this finding, many small communities must undertake appropriate action to improve housing for low income families. Over one-half of the 36 cities were found to have significant needs for improved low income housing.

Fourteen cities were found to need more housing for the elderly, a type of housing which appears to be generally acceptable to small communities. In nearly all the communities having a fairly obvious strong need for more adequate housing for the elderly, the officials pointed it out as one of the major needs. Although the communities appeared to have widely divergent attitudes and concerns for low income housing needs as contrasted to housing for the elderly, the study team did not encounter predominant patterns of strong interest or attitudes concerning housing needs for moderate income families. Approximately one-half of the 36 communities were found to have a fairly strong need for more satisfactory housing conditions for moderate income families.

The *need for correcting the inadequacy of community facilities* were found to be particularly important in nine communities as compared to the norm for the entire 36 communities in the study group. However each of the 36 communities has some community facilities which are either clearly inadequate or is missing a facility required for a given service (such as no public library).

A *need for more adequate fire stations* was found in 20 communities. In many of these cases, a community has a sufficient number of stations, but they are functionally obsolescent. A fire station that was built sometime ago may not be properly located to allow its engines an effective running time to neighborhood areas that must be served. Even though a station is well located, it may not be structurally sound or meet spatial requirements for its equipment and firefighters. In several communities, recent rapid growth has created a need for an additional number of fire stations.

A *need for more adequate police headquarters* was found in 18 communities. In many of these places, the police department is quartered in the same building that houses the local governments principal administrative offices (usually the city hall). Most of the 36 communities have city halls that were built some time ago and many do not have sufficient space for the needs of modern police operations. Also, the study team found that some of the more progressive-minded city of-

ficials recognize the increased efficiency and economy that are likely to accrue from planning new spatial arrangements that link the city police headquarters with that of the fire department or with the county police operations.

A *need for a new city hall* was found in 17 communities. In many cases this need was not recognized by the officials and other leaders of the community who were interviewed by the study team. In sharp contrast to this situation, several communities in the study group have very modern city halls. These new city halls provide adequate arrangements for conducting city business. Perhaps of even greater significance, as explained by officials in those communities, a city hall is a symbol of the city and its outward physical appearance has a strong influence on the attitudes of citizens toward their community.

The study team observed that many of the older city halls have small unattractive council chambers and meeting rooms. These substandard conditions negatively influence citizen involvement in community affairs, either as participants of official city boards and commissions or as part of larger groups who wish to attend the meetings of these official bodies.

A *need to correct major deficiencies of the street system* was found in 15 communities. In most cases, these needs were recognized by the officials of the communities. Street deficiencies include several types of substandard conditions—a large percentage of streets that are without paved surfaces, curbs, and gutters; lack of adequate arterial streets for the expeditious movement of "through" traffic; and a preponderant pattern of narrow and poorly aligned streets that necessitate circuitous vehicular movements through one-way street patterns to travel between points within the community.

A *need for more adequate refuse disposal facilities* was pointed out by officials in 10 communities. Most of the communities in the study group utilize a dump in a relatively isolated location, but within a reasonably short hauling distance. Refuse and other forms of waste are dumped at the site, and usually covered with dirt each day after the combustibles have been burned. Although there are various combinations of burning and covering, a refuse dump is nearly always a nuisance to adjacent properties. Finding a suitable dumpsite is becoming more and more difficult. A comparatively few small communities are burning refuse in incinerators, but this is a more expensive process as compared to a dump within a reasonable haul distance, and requires the dumping of the burned residue.

Some communities which operate a dump are seeking arrangements with nearby communities to operate a joint dumpsite facility. Satisfactory disposal of urban solid waste (garbage, debris, etc.) represents a major unresolved problem for large communities, and as found in this study, even for many small communities.

A *need for providing a more adequate water supply* was found in only seven of the 36 communities. Since an adequate water supply (including storage and filtration) is the most basic requirement for any community, it is not surprising to find that a large proportion of the communities have met this problem for the foreseeable future. On the other hand, water supplies represent a nationwide problem of considerable magnitude due to expanding population, increasing con-

sumption of water per capita, increasing pollution, and gradual depletion of ground-water supplies. It may be that the small proportion of communities in the study group with water supply problems reflect the large number of the study group communities which have utilized Federal program assistance to improve their water systems.

A *need for expanding the water distribution system* was found in only nine communities, for reasons similar to those described above. The principal factors in water distribution relate to a network of water lines that serve all areas of the city and are of a size and condition that provide adequate quantities and pressure for domestic, industrial, and fire protection requirements.

A *need for more adequate sewage treatment plants* was found in 13 communities. All of the 36 communities have some type of sewage treatment, but the degree of the treatment is subject to wide variances. The purpose of treating sewage is to reduce its pollution effect on the streams or bodies of water which receive the final sewage effluent. Both the states and the Federal government have developed rigid standards for treating sewage. Due to the high cost of treating sewage according to state and Federal standards, many communities have yet to comply with such requirements. There has also been a revision of the standards in recent years. Some communities installed a "primary" treatment plant which complied with standards that prevailed at the time. "Secondary" treatment is usually necessary to meet current standards, and "tertiary" treatment is being considered for higher standards in the not too distant future.

A *need for adequate sanitary sewage collection systems* was found in only eight communities. A sanitary sewer collection system refers to the network of underground lines that collect and transmit sewage to the treatment plant. An inadequate collection system is usually due to a need for extending sewage lines to serve built-up areas of the community which lack this service. In other cases, a collection system is inadequate because many of the sewer lines need to be replaced with larger pipe sizes to serve areas of the city that have undergone rapid growth.

A *need for adequate storm sewer systems* was found in 20 of the 36 communities. A storm sewer system refers to a network of underground lines which collect and transmit surface water run-off from streets and other public right-of-ways. The inadequacy of a storm sewer system is usually indicated by poor drainage of streets or by the over-loading of sewer lines which collect both storm water and sewage, or by the over-loading of sewage treatment plants which are receiving surface water run-off combined with sewage.

A storm sewer system separate from a sanitary sewage collection system can be a very costly undertaking which explains the use of so many combined systems in small communities.

Social

The social problems and needs of small communities relate to a broad range of activities, programs and services. Particular emphasis is given to major social factors that directly affect the quality of urban life. In contrast to the effect on urban life by the other three sectors—governmental, economic, and physical—social factors have more direct influence on the quality of life for the community's residents.

Three major social factors have been selected, and each one serves as a community characteristic for this study of small communities. These are health and medical services, education, and recreation, and cultural activities.

Major *need for improved health and medical services* was found in 14 communities. Eight of these communities have less than 6,000 population and the other 6 communities have less than 13,000 population.

Health services were found to be administered by the county government rather than by the city in nearly all of the 36 communities. The inadequacy of health services are due largely to a lack of sufficient professional staff and to a lack of mental health centers and nursing services.

The inadequacy of health services was found to be due largely to lack of sufficient doctors, hospital facilities, and specialized institutions for the care of the indigent, the elderly, and patients with chronic diseases.

The responsibility for providing adequate health and medical services is widely diffused among various public and private agencies. For example, hospitals and specialized institutions are often operated by private agencies, and the total number of available doctors are subject to factors beyond the control of any public or private agency. Perhaps these are underlying reasons for inadequate health and medical services in a large number of small communities.

A *major need to correct deficiencies in the public school system* was found in six communities. Three of these communities have a small population—less than 7,000—and the other three are in the 11,000–14,000 population range. All six of the school systems have inadequate classrooms, four systems do not provide vocational training, three systems were cited as having poor teaching staffs, and two systems have high student drop-out rates and a low percentage of high school graduates who seek higher education.

The proportionate low number of communities which have major inadequacies in their school systems would appear to indicate that the small communities in the study group tend to have a high regard for the importance of a good public school system and have been willing to extend sufficient financial support to achieve and maintain such a system.

A major *need for improving recreation and cultural programs* was found in 12 communities. Eight of these communities have populations less than 6,000 and three of the four other communities have less than 14,000 population.

Recreation and culture are considered together because of the overlapping nature of these programs. For example, programs that feature music, art, drama, crafts, and lectures are usually a part of both well-rounded organized public recreation programs and privately sponsored cultural programs and events.

Common examples of the latter groups found in the small communities are YMCAs, community concert associations, little theatres, great books discussion groups, community arts associations, craft guilds, and literary clubs.

In considering the inadequacies of each type of community service and facility, the study team found the most prevalent to be *recreational*

services and facilities including such facets as organized recreation programs, multi-purpose indoor recreational centers, senior citizen centers, swimming pools, and ball diamonds. Officials of 24 of the 36 cities pointed out a need to correct deficiencies in community recreation facilities. From the standpoint of being essential to community life, recreation facilities are, of course, less important than are those facilities which a community must rely upon for serving the basic needs of its citizens. Adequate facilities for fire, police, and traffic have higher priority than swimming pools and ball diamonds.

Therefore to find recreation facilties at the bottom of the list from the standpoint of adequacy is not surprising. However it is interesting to note that small community officials regard more adequate recreation facilities as a major need. This attitude reflects a growing recognition of the importance of recreation to community life.

A *need for providing more parks* was found in 13 communities. The term "parks" includes various sizes and purposes of open spaces for public use. For example, a "tot lot" is usually a separate tiny area devoted to small play equipment for pre-school age children, and a "playground" is often just large enough (one to five acres) for one or two soft ball diamonds and gymnastic equipment for school age children and young adults. The more recent term of "mini-parks" usually refers to a combined "tot-lot" and small playground. On the other hand, the term "park" is apt to refer to open spaces larger than playgrounds and containing landscaped areas for passive enjoyment, but may contain sections devoted to athletic fields, playground or tot-lot use. The total pattern of a city's park system may include open spaces for all these uses as well as areas for other special recreational purposes. The adequacy of a park system depends principally upon whether or not there is sufficient total acreage for the population to prevent over-crowding and whether or not the relative sizes and locations of the parks serve all age groups as well as all geographic areas of the city. Some of the small communities have very fine parks, but have a deficiency in tot-lot and playgrounds for certain geographic areas—often in the neighborhoods that house the low income and minority residents.

A *need for an adequate public library facility was found* in nine communities. Four of these places (among the smaller communities) do not have any public library. In the other five communities, the principal inadequacy is due to the lack of proper space for book stacks and reading rooms. The officials in all these communities recognized these needs, and in most cases, have plans to correct these deficiencies.

SMALL COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS—COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP VERSUS MINORITY VIEWS

Visits to four small communities—Atoka, Oklahoma; Dunkirk, New York; McAllen, Texas; and Seaside, California—were made by both the general study team and the minority study team. The following is a summary of major problems and needs as perceived by the community leadership (i.e. public officials, business and industrial leaders, civic committee members, etc.) on the one hand, and representatives of the minority community on the other. These views are reflected in

greater detail in the individual community profiles which are a part of the general and the minority group studies.

Jobs and Housing

The two most frequently mentioned needs expressed to members of both study teams in all four communities were the lack of jobs and the need for additional housing. The lack of industry or the absence of sufficient industrial diversification was mentioned frequently as being of major importance to residents in general. However, perceptions of what this actually meant differed between the two general groups. Public officials viewed the need for additional industry as a major element in assuring a larger tax base to finance city services. Members of the business community perceived the need in terms of increased bank deposits, retail sales, etc. The minority community on the other hand saw the availability of more industry in many instances as a means of economic survival itself. In addition to the general lack of jobs, members of the minority community in all four communities visited complained about job discrimination, low wages in comparison with white employees and the inability to meet job qualifications. (The question of vocational training is discussed under "Education" below.)

Manpower, on-the-job training, and neighborhood youth corps programs are in operation in two of the four communities. Although minority members were generally pleased with the presence of such programs, feelings were expressed that they need to be expanded and improved.

It is also interesting to note that many of the community leaders interviewed in the four communities viewed the solving of the employment problem as some kind of a "cure-all" for community problems and needs in general. In other words, if sufficient jobs are made available for all residents, questions of adequate housing, health, welfare and other needs would somehow take care of themselves.

Housing as indicated previously was also regarded by community leaders and the minority community alike as a major problem. In some instances *additional* housing was stated as the "need" with little thought given to needed rehabilitation or improvement of the existing residential structures. As would be expected, the vast majority of all substandard housing in the four communities was located in the miority residential areas. While city officials in three of the four communities had made efforts in providing low and moderate income housing for minority members, the new housing in some instances was reportedly too expensive for most minority residents. In the fourth community, city officials had not even looked into the possibilities of providing Federally financed housing for its minority population. Housing segregation was evident in some cases in both private residential developments and public housing projects although this was of course largely due to existing neighborhood patterns.

Health and Social Needs

The adequacy of health and social services and facilities was not viewed as a major community problem or need by the community leadership in the four communities. However the opposite was the case in terms of the feelings of the minority community. Although both the quantity and quality of health and social services varied in

the four communities, feelings were generally expressed that additional public health centers and staff, family planning services, day care centers and health and nutritional education programs were needed. In one community the lack of health inspections, reluctance of doctors to visit minority neighborhoods, and the absence of ambulance service, were cited by representatives of the minority community as of major concern to residents. In addition, strict and unrealistic welfare requirements, and high medical costs were mentioned frequently in all communities as major problems for many minority residents.

Education

Education officials and minority residents alike listed the lack of vocational training schools as having a direct correlation with the unemployment problems in the community. In two of the communities, parents in the minority community reported that children were not encouraged by school counselors to pursue academic careers and yet no practical vocational courses were available to provide them for other endeavors. Minority residents in one community claimed that the local school system was not making a serious effort to employ qualified minority teachers. Adult education classes were being offered in all four communities but some minority residents expressed the feeling that few efforts had been made to encourage attendance by the minority population.

Financial Institutions

The availability of customer loans for such things as housing and home improvements was viewed especially by banking and other financial institution officials as problems of major concern. Members of the minority community however indicated that they encountered other obstacles in addition to generally tight monetary policies and high interest rates. These were reported as the unwillingness of financial institutions in most cases to assume any degree of risk for minority residents. The minority study team found no examples of financial aid to potential minority businesses by local financial institutions.

Intra-City Public Transportation

The availability of adequate intra-city public transportation in the community was perceived as a major problem in all four communities by the minority population although its importance was not stressed by the community leadership as a whole. One of the four communities had no facilities of this type. In the other three communities, major criticisms involved scheduling and the convenience or distance to such facilities. The need for better intra-city public transportation was viewed as particularly critical for those in the minority community who had no private transportation to get to places of employment, health clinics and so forth.

Community facilities

The need for substantial improvements in physical facilities such as streets and water, sewer and waste treatment facilities were viewed as needing major attention in only two of the four communities by public officials and other community leaders. In both communities, the major problem centered around the number of unpaved streets. Streets

were completed unpaved in one of the communities. At the same time, however, minority members voiced concern about such facilities in only one community. In this case, representatives indicated that the lack of paved streets, street lighting and deficient water, storm drainage and sewerage systems were major problems for the residents.

Community leaders in all four communities felt that present recreation and park facilities were adequate overall although there were some individual comments made about the need for either improved or additional facilities. Minority representatives in three of the communities indicated a definite need for additional recreation and park facilities particularly in their residential areas.

Out-migration

The out-migration of young people in particular from the community was listed as a major problem by community leaders and the minority population in all four communities. The major reasons were usually reported as lack of employment and inadequate housing facilities although there were obviously other contributing factors. In one of the four communities, however, the out-migration was largely due to the presence of substantial military personnel stationed at the military base adjacent to the community. The out-migration of young people from the community was incidentally a major problem in the majority of the forty communities visited by the general and minority study teams.

Minority representation

Representation by the minority population on the City Council was found to exist in only one of the four communities visited by the study teams, while appointments to boards and commissions had taken place in only two of the communities. Minority members viewed the lack of representation as major obstacles in getting the community at large to become both aware of, and interested in helping to solve their problems. Communications between community leaders and the minority community were also viewed as major problems.

In summary, the perceptions of the major problems and needs in each of the four communities were shared by both the community leadership and the minority population in some instances, particularly with regard to jobs and housing. However, even here, the problems were generally considered of a much more serious nature by the minority population largely because it was more directly affected by the lack of employment opportunities and decent housing. In other areas such as health and social needs, education, political representation and public transportation, the perceptions varied more widely between the two groups.

It should also be noted that the solution to the housing shortage, for example, for the minority population was not just the construction of additional dwelling units. In most instances the minority resident still was faced with the possibility of not being able to obtain a loan either because of insufficient assets or in some cases solely because of his color. Moreover, he also was confronted with the fact that he might not be able to move into the neighborhood of his choice. In short, perceptions of what the needs actually were and the hurdles to overcome in solving them differed widely between the community leadership and the minority population.

70-132—71——5

SMALL COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP AND INVOLVEMENT

Community leadership and involvement are important factors to consider in any study of the problems and needs of small communities. In many instances they are important indicators in assessing the progress of the community as it attempts to deal with vital local issues. In each of the thirty-six communities visited, the study teams made a general analysis and evaluation of the degree and extent of community leadership and involvement.

The study found that leadership and community-wide involvement overall was generally low. Only five, or 14 percent of the communities, were considered to have a high level of leadership and involvement. A further analysis of the five communities indicated that they had the following characteristics: (a) four of the five cities had populations of 25,000 or over; (b) all five cities had a high level of both government organization and services and had or were making strong efforts to improve community development; (c) four of the five cities had the council-manager form of government and had made good use of Federal programs.

It is interesting to analyse the reasons why these communities had a relatively high level of community leadership and involvement compared with others in the study. While it is, of course, impossible to fully explain these reasons based on a limited two to three day visit in each community, the following observations can be made. In all communities, the city government had made a strong and deliberate effort to encourage citizen participation. This was primarily done through the establishment of citizens committees responsible for advising the governing body on a wide range of community issues and problems. In addition, in all five communities there had been strong political leadership provided by the mayor and city council. Four of the five communities as indicated above also had a professional city administrative officer to implement legislative policy.

In addition, each of the communities had other characteristics that contributed to the degree and extent of citizen involvement and participation in the community. In one instance, the community's young, well-educated population and the fact that the municipality had only been incorporated since 1956 and had no strong traditional ties were major contributing factors. In another community, the strong leadership provided by the local newspaper and the executives of the banking institutions provided the initial and continuing spark for community involvement and progress. Both a declining economic condition and a rapidly deteriorating housing situation in a third instance led to citizen awareness and a determination to improve the community led by a new city council and dedicated city manager.

Fifteen of the cities (42 percent) were evaluated as having a low level of leadership and involvement. A comparison with other significant community indicators showed the following: (a) 60 percent of the 15 cities had a low growth rate and poor use of federal programs; (b) 70 percent of these cities had populations of 10,000 or less. a low median family income and a low fiscal effort; (c) 80 percent of the cities had a low level of both government organization and services, community development, and poor educational attainment.

Although most of the communities visited had the usual array of organizations, few were reportedly involved directly in the broader aspects of community endeavor—formulation of long-range goals, implementation of comprehensive planning programs, work on bond campaigns for capital improvements and other efforts of this nature. In most instances community organizations were largely involved with their own activities and programs. The pattern was essentially the same as far as the business community was concerned. Although some chamber of commerce organizations were actively involved in promoting economic activity, many were doing little to help attract industrial and business concerns. With few exceptions, other business leaders were not directly involved in overall community affairs. The lack of involvement was particularly regrettable in the smaller, non urban communities where leadership was so desperately needed to help solve community problems.

Although the study teams did not make a detailed evaluation of the reasons behind the general lack of community leadership and involvement, a number of reasons are fairly apparent. In some communities, problems and needs were not of major magnitude. In other instances, the age of the community and its declining economic condition were fairly apparent reasons for the low level or participation. The study teams found that the lack of involvement in some communities was due either to the lack of change in the city administration for many years or the political control of the community vested in the hands of old, established firms and families. The mayor of one city in defending the lack of any citizen boards and commissions, simply stated that such committees merely got in the way and were not needed.

General apathy is probably one of the major reasons that can be cited to explain this situation. It is a well-known fact that many residents simply are not sufficiently concerned about community problems to become actively involved in working toward goals for their solution. The study teams also found that the level of involvement could be correlated with the type of community problems that existed. City officials and other community leaders and the general public in most communities exhibited a conservative attitude toward problems involving social issues and particularly those involved with the minority community. Federal programs such as those concerned with welfare and poverty, housing and urban renewal were major issues in many communities. In a number of the communities visited, housing and urban renewal programs had been defeated by the electorate. Experience with Federal programs are discussed in more detail later in this section.

Five of the thirty-six communities visited had model cities programs. Although all of them were still in the planning year at the time of the visit, the program by its very nature had reportedly resulted in increased community involvement. In one instance, however, the increased involvement had unfortunately resulted in further perpetuation of a long standing split in the community.

In a few communities, the strong personality of the mayor played a significant role in providing needed community leadership. In all but one instance this leadership had been positive in nature and

resulted in the community moving ahead in tackling urgent problems and needs.

The study, in summary, found that the extent of community leadership and involvement in broad community issues was minimal in most cases. In cases where the opposite situation was true, the city government had actively encouraged widespread city participation in community affairs. In addition, business and other leaders in the private sector had taken the initiative themselves to make their community a better place in which to live.

THE SMALL COMMUNITY AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

One of the primary concerns of the study was to determine the extent of intergovernmental arrangements or agreements between the communities visited and other governmental agencies. Community officials were specifically asked—"what contractual arrangements or agreements presently exist between the city and other governmental units?"

In the vast majority of communities visited, the major or only arrangements were the traditional ones in the areas of health and welfare with the county in most instances designated as the administrative agency. In approximately 70 percent of the communities, health and welfare functions were administered at the county level. This figure dropped to 50 percent however in instances where assessment and tax collection functions were concerned. The majority of the thirty-six communities had their own library facilities and services, with less than one-third operated at the county level. Other services provided at the county level included animal control, civil defense, planning, parks and recreation, airport management and hospital operations.

The study team found few examples of either joint city-county or joint city-school service type of arrangements. Only nine communities were found to be sharing services with either the county or school district in their area. These included planning, joint city-county administrative facilities, housing, urban renewal, recreation and parks, civil defense, library, hospital and fire services. Only three cities were found to be providing services to other municipalities while five received services from either another city, township or school district. In eight cities, services ranging from water and sewage treatment to planning and parks and recreation are provided by either a metropolitan agency, joint authority or separate district. In only three communities were services being performed by the state government.

In short, with the exception of the traditional county administration of health, welfare, assessment and tax collection functions, the study found few examples of the sharing or joint-use of governmental services and facilities.

Prior to the field trips to the thirty-six communities, letters were sent to all thirty-four of the states in which the municipalities were located. Seventeen states were later contacted in person or by telephone to get a general indication of the role they were playing in assisting small communities. Many states indicated that they were just getting started and had only formed state departments of community affairs

in the last few years. This was generally confirmed by discussions with local officials in each of the thirty-six communities, who stated that they had had little contact with the state government.

Financial assistance was usually found to consist of the usual grant-in-aids derived from motor vehicle taxes, gas taxes, and sales taxes. Few examples of technical assistance from the state were found with the exception of occasional help in processing an application of "701" funds or in preparation of a workable program. Communities in the states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Connecticut did however comment on the good working relationship between the two governmental jurisdictions and the help that the state had provided either through financial or technical assistance.

In fairness to the states, it should be noted that state offices of community affairs have largely been created in only the last two or three years. Hopefully, as they develop in the immediate years ahead, increased financial and technical assistance will be forthcoming to help small communities to solve their problems. A more detailed description of what some states are doing and recommendations for a larger state role are discussed below in Section V.

During the field trips, the study teams also contacted regional planning agencies and councils of government in the area. Interestingly enough, such agencies had been created in thirty-two of the thirty-six areas visited. On the other hand, local officials in only a few communities expressed high praise for the efforts of the agencies to date. Here again however it should be observed that the majority had only been established in the last few years, providing insufficient time to objectively appraise their effectiveness. As indicated later in the report, one study team visited the first established non-metropolitan planning district. Although the organization reporetdly had the enthusiastic support of all municipalities, its effectiveness was limited by a very small operating budget.

The phenomeneal growth of regional agencies in recent years and how they can be more effective is also discussed below in Section V.

SMALL COMMUNITY NEEDS FOR OUTSIDE ASSISTANCE

The need of a small community for outside assistance refers to assistance from the state and/or Federal government to improve the capabilities of the city government. Two major types of capabilities are involved—financial and technical. Many small communitiies are faced with urgent needs to improve their municipal services and facilities but their city governments are unable to obtain the required extra funds from within the communities. Other small communities have a reasonably good financial capability but are lacking in administrative and technical staff employees that have sufficient qualifications for carrying out the functions of city government so as to achieve reasonably acceptable results. As found in this study, and as would be expected, a large number of the small communities have strong needs for both types of outside assistance.

A need for outside financial assistance arises from such problems as a low value per capita of tax assessable property, high total property tax burdens, little or no annual revenue from the state or other

levels of government, stringent financing limitations imposed by the state, and major inadequacies of municipal services and facilities.

The need for more adequate outside financial assistance was found in 16 communities as compared to the entire 36 communities in the study group. All of these communities except two have populations less than 14,000. A community was designated as having a major need for outside financial assistance if its "fiscal capacity" was found to have a lower rating than its rating for "needs". Nine of these communities were rated "low" for fiscal capacity, but five of them had a "high" rating for needs, and the other four had a "medium" rating for needs. The other seven communities had a "medium" rating for fiscal capacity but a "high" rating for needs.

A need for outside technical assistance arises from such problems as the increased complexity of municipal government operations, the increased expectations and demands of citizens for greater economy in government operations while at the same time asking for improved services and facilities, a larger need for technical specialization by municipal employees coupled with relatively small workloads in given specialties that do not justify the employment of full-time specialists, personnel recruitment problems caused by low salary levels and a narrow base of qualified available applicants, and lack of community resources for sponsoring adequate in-service training programs.

A need for outside technical assistance was found to be a major need in 14 communities in comparison with a norm for the entire study groups. All of these 14 places have populations less than 14,000. The criteria for designating these 14 communities as having a major need for outside technical assistance included such major deficiences as lack of a professional administrator, few qualified department heads, inadequate personnel administration policies and practices, and insufficient in-service training programs.

USE OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS BY SMALL COMMUNITIES

The Federal programs included in this study are those programs that are administered by local governments and housing programs administered by private groups. Emphasis has been placed on programs affecting community development rather than programs which focus directly on individual citizens.

Only two of the 36 communities have not used any Federal programs. All the other 34 communities represent a wide variance in the use of Federal programs. Four communities have used only one program, and at the other extreme three communities have each used nine different programs. On the basis of total Federal program aid, with program grants and loans combined as a single sum, one community has received approximately $900 per capital. For all the other places, the per capita amount ranges downward from this maximum. The median average for the entire study group is approximately $250 per capita.

The most widely used program among the study group of communities has been "701" planning. Twenty-seven of the 36 communities have received Federal assistance from "701" in financing their comprehensive plans. The next most widely used type of program has been

for sewage system improvement. Twenty-six communities have received Federal financial assistance for sewage projects, primarily from the Department of Interior. HUD's program for water system improvements has been used by 13 communities.

A total of 20 communities have received assistance for various types and phases of urban renewal programs. In eight of these 20 communities, the program has been of a combined nature covering both residential and commercial areas. Another eight communities have had urban renewal grants for improving only the central business district, with five obtaining funds for planning the project, and three receiving grants for actual construction.

In the area of low rent public housing, 17 communities have federal public housing units for low income families. In four of these communities, a county housing authority has built and administered these projects. The others use city housing authorities. Federal housing projects for elderly people were found in 11 communities. Moderate income housing financed by the FHA 221 (d)(3) programs are in eight of the study group communities, but very little use has been made of the other types of Federal housing programs. Three communities have leased housing for low income families, and three other places have rent supplement housing. The Section 235 program was found in two communities. Only one community had a code enforcement project.

Eleven communities have used the public works planning advance program to commence the planning of various types of community facility projects. Four communities had public works grants for storm sewers. Another seven communities have availed themselves of the open space program funds for acquiring needed park land. Only three communities have participated in the Federal beautification program.

Three communities received grants for airport improvements and one community was the recipient of a public facilities loan. Four of the 36 communities are model cities and have received funds for planning.

Each of the 36 communities in the study group has been rated on the basis of its total use of Federal programs in relation to the norm for the entire group. Each rating of a community is based upon the relative number and size of the programs used in that community. The dollar amount of a grant or loan was used as a measurement of program "size."

Ten communities were assigned a low rating, and include two communities that have not used any Federal programs. Each community in the low rated group averages approximately one program and $15 per capita. Eleven communities were assigned a medium rating, and average approximately four programs and $160 per capita for a single community. Fifteen communities were found to merit a high rating, and average approximately seven programs and $500 per capita per community.

COMMUNITY EXPERIENCES IN THE USE OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

In interviewing community officials and other leaders concerning their experiences with Federal programs, the study team obtained far more comments related to needed improvements than to favorable

aspects of the programs. Yet in all but a very few communities, the final results of completed projects were considered to be very satisfactory and beneficial.

In answer to other general questions in the profile on Federal program experience, officials in most of the communities reported that they were assisted by Federal representatives and consultants in preparing program applications. A majority of communities do not feel that additional assistance should be available for preparing program applications.

Well over one-half of the communities do not have special referenda or other local requirements before they can accept Federal programs. Only a few communities have had Federal programs disapproved locally, but approximately one-half of the communities in the study group have had Federal program applications disapproved at the Federal level.

Few communities are generally satisfied with the administrative procedures they were required to follow, or with the administration of Federal programs at the Federal level. The principal difficulties with Federal programs, as reported by local officials, concern an undue amount and complexity of paperwork required at the local level, and lengthy delays in receiving notification of decisions from the Federal government. Several of the smaller communities pointed out the difficulty they are experiencing in keeping informed on available programs.

Some communities felt that HUD representatives should spend more time in educating local officials in Federal program procedures before the preparation of an actual project application is commenced. Also they feel that HUD representatives should do more checking of a community's general condition and "climate" in order to convey suggestions and possible pitfalls to local communities based on an analysis of the community as well as a knowledge of Federal program experiences in other communities. They complained of the rapid personnel turnover in HUD representatives and the fact that some representatives are inexperienced in local government operations.

Many communities reported that project implementation procedures are too complex, including frequent changes in regulations and frequent requests from Federal offices for additional information that had not been requested during earlier stages. A few local officials who have had extensive experience with Federal programs commented that Federal program requirements should be simplified through the implementation of a general policy that places more trust in the officials of the communities.

Many local officials were particularly disturbed by the long delays in receiving decisions and other replies from Federal offices. They pointed out two very serious types of problems that result from long delays—escalation of construction costs and loss of interest and enthusiasm in the programs by local leaders and citizens. Several communities pointed out that strong citizen involvement had dissipated during the lengthy lapsed time in waiting to hear if Federal funds would be forthcoming for a project they had initiated. Some officials suggested that many of these delays could be prevented if Federal regional offices could have more decision-making authority, if they were more ade-

quately staffed with qualified technical specialists, and if there could be more coordination between the regional offices of Federal departments.

Suggestions for new Federal programs by some of the communities included financial assistance for refuse disposal facilities, senior citizen centers, the operation of fire and police departments and off-street parking. It was also suggested that a program be designed to provide Federal funds to a community which designs an acceptable program of its own.

Section V. Federal Assistance to Small Communities

Within the last few years, there has been a substantial increase in the number of Federal grant-in-aid and loan programs available to all communities, some of which have been tailored specifically for the small community of under 50,000 population. The distinguishing features of the present system of Federal assistance can be traced back more than a century to the enactment of the Morrill Act in 1862. The Act established land-grant colleges and instituted certain minimum requirements. The pattern was thus established for providing needed resources in exchange for acceptance of certain national standards. This type of aid has come to be known as "categorical" grants.

Federal aid was extended to agricultural programs around the turn of the century. The second decade of the 20th century saw the inauguration of Federal assistance programs for highways and vocational education and rehabilitation. In the depression years of the 1930's, the financial emergencies of the time led the Federal government to launch an unprecedented range of new welfare and economic security programs in addition to legislation to provide low-rent public housing and improved health services.

The years following World War II saw the establishment of a series of new categorical grants for such things as health care, education in selected fields and areas, and for renewing the physical environment of the nation's cities. In more recent years, significant steps have been taken to broaden elementary, secondary and higher educational opportunities; to develop economically depressed areas of the country; and to launch a concerted attack on poverty. In 1966 a comprehensive new program was enacted to transform blighted and slum areas of cities into model neighborhoods.[1]

Increasing population and rapid urbanization have led to greater demands for the services traditionally provided by state and local governments. The results have been a substantial increase in both the number and magnitude of Federal aid programs. The 1969 *Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance* prepared by the Office of Economic Opportunity contains a listing and description of 581 programs administered by 47 federal departments and agencies.[2] While not all of these programs have been funded each year since their establishment, the number in itself indicates the growing influence of the Federal

[1] Office of the Vice President, *The Vice President's Handbook for Local Officials,* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1967) p. 3.
[2] Office of Economic Opportunity, *Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance,* (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1969).

government in state and local affairs. Needless to say, these programs have had a substantial impact on the more than 5,000 communities in this country with less than 50,000 population.

The study has been concerned largely with programs administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and how they can be more effective in meeting the needs of the small community. For this reason an analysis and evaluation has not been made of programs in other Federal agencies with the exception of those functional areas such as housing and water, sewer and waste treatment facilities where a number of agencies are providing financial and technical assistance to small communities. The study has been based on a general analysis of HUD-assisted programs—their purpose and objective, financing, administration and implementation.

The following parts of this section discuss the Federal programs available to small communities, an evaluation of Federal programs including recommendations for the modification of existing programs and for new programs, the administration of Federal programs, state assistance to small communities, and the growth of regional agencies.

PROGRAMS AVAILABLE TO SMALL COMMUNITIES

A wide range of Federal programs are available to small communities. These can generally be divided into three categories: planning assistance programs, technical assistance programs and physical development programs. The following is a brief description of the programs—their purpose, financial assistance available, specific small community priorities, geographical applicability and required prerequisites.

Planning Assistance Programs

Three planning assistance programs are available to communities, two of which are required prerequisites for a number of Federal programs. These are the comprehensive planning assistance program, workable program for community improvement and the community renewal program.

Comprehensive Planning Assistance Program

The Comprehensive Planning Assistance Program of the Federal Government (legally known as the "Urban Planning Assistance Program") was established by Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954. Its purpose is to assist states, regions, metropolitan agencies and local communities through federal grants in solving planning problems. Since its adoption in 1954, the program has been successively broadened in scope and scale through legislative amendment and administrative policy changes.

The legislation which established the program had three basic purposes: (1) assist state and local governments in planning problems resulting from the increasing concentration of population in metropolitan and in other urban areas, including smaller communities; (2) facilitate comprehensive planning for urban development, including coordinated transportation systems on a continuing basis; and (3) encourage state and local governments to establish and improve planning

staffs.[3] The original legislation has been modified in almost every Congressional session since 1954. Major changes have included the following: raising of the population limit for eligibility from 25,000 to 50,000; broadening of the act to facilitate planning on a continuing basis; increasing the size of the Federal grant from one-half to two-thirds of the total cost; and increasing the scope of the act as to both the definition of comprehensive planning and areas or public bodies eligible for assistance.

The Housing Act of 1968 contained some important changes relevant to small communities. These are as follows:

1. Authorized the Secretary of HUD, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, to make planning grants to state planning agencies for assistance to "district" planning agencies in rural and other nonmetropolitan areas.

2. Authorized the making of planning grants directly to regional and district councils of governments as well as those organized on a metropolitan basis; various regional commissions established under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (in addition to the Appalachian Regional Commission); economic development districts designated under the same Act; and cities within metropolitan areas (without regard to the population limits which otherwise apply under 701) for planning which is part of metropolitan planning.[4]

The "701" program initially had a limited budget of a few million dollars but has grown dramatically in the last few years with the increased emphasis on "planning". By 1967 appropriations had grown to $33 million and over the 13-year life period of the program to that date, a total of $146.2 million had been appropriated. Of this amount, 35.8 percent has been used for assistance to small communities and counties.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development reports that there are almost 33,000 jurisdictions eligible for 701 planning assistance in the United States. Between 1960 and 1965, 4,300 communities participated in the program. In 1967 a total of 818 grants were approved with 489 or 59.7 percent going to small communities and counties.[5]

A number of Federal aid programs specifically require the completion of a comprehensive plan before a community may obtain financial assistance. These include the Open-Space Land program, Urban Beautification, Historical Preservation and Neighborhood Facilities. Applications for HUD's water and sewer facilities programs currently require that an areawide comprehensive plan must be underway as a prerequisite to receiving financial assistance. As of October 1, 1970, however, both the water and sewer and open space programs will require as prerequisites the completion of *areawide* planning elements and implementation programs.

---

[3] Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Urban Planning Guide*, p. 1.
[4] General Summary, Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, P.L. 90-448 (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, August, 1968), p. 12.
[5] Hammer, Greene, Siler Associates, *Comprehensive Planning Assistance in the Small Community*, (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, March 1969) p. 9.

Workable Program for Community Improvement

The workable program requirement as a prerequisite for certain Federal programs was first introduced in the Housing Act of 1954. The language of the act although not very specific stated that "no contract shall be entered into for any loan or grant . . . unless (1) there is . . . a workable program for community improvement which shall include an official plan of action, as it exists from time to time, for effectively dealing with the problem of urban slums and blight within the community." (Sec. 303 of the act of 1954, amending sec. 101 of the act of 1949).

"The basic purpose of the workable program requirement is to ensure that communities desiring to utilize funds for renewal and housing programs understand the array of forces that create slums and blight and are willing to recognize and take the steps within their power to prevent and overcome urban blight. The workable program is based on recognition that the Federal and local relationship is one of partnership in the task, and that Federal funds for renewal and housing projects cannot, by themselves, be effective unless localities exercise the full range of their powers in community efforts on a sustained and coordinated basis to the objective of preventing and eradicating slums and blight."

The specific requirements of the workable program were revised in 1969 and presently call for progress in four areas: code adoption and enforcement, planning and programming, housing and relocation, and citizen involvement. Certifications and recertifications have been changed from one year to two year intervals. Although the workable program requirement originally applied basically to only urban renewal programs it was later broadened to include the following HUD-assisted programs:

a. Urban Renewal Program.
b. Neighborhood Development Program.
c. Concentrated Code Enforcement Program.
d. Interim Assistance for Blighted Areas.
e. Demolition Grant Program.
f. Community Renewal Program.
g. General Neighborhood Renewal Plan.
h. Rehabilitation loans and grants in urban renewal and concentrated code enforcement areas (sec. 115 and 312).
i. Low-Rent Housing Program, except for Section 23, Short Term Leased Housing.
j. Mortgage insurance under FHA Sec. 220 for housing construction and rehabilitation in urban renewal project areas.
k. Mortgage insurance under FHA 221(d)(3) at market or below-market interest rate projects for low and moderate income families.
l. Rent Supplement Projects under Sec. 221(d)(3) for low-income families, with certain exceptions.[6]

The Housing Act of 1969, however, eliminated the workable program requirement from all housing programs. The program therefore

[6] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Workable Program for Community Improvement*, (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, October 1968), Chapter 1, pp. 1–2.

currently applies only to the various programs concerned with urban renewal.

Community Renewal Program

This program provides grants to assist in preparing a community-wide renewal strategy covering the full range of renewal actions required to meet a community's needs. This includes rehabilitation, code enforcement, redevelopment, neighborhood development programs, capital improvements, social action, antipoverty programs, etc. Grants may not exceed two-thirds of the cost of preparing, completing, or revising the Community Renewal Program, with the remaining cost to be borne by the community. An application for a Community Renewal Program Grant will not be accepted unless either HUD has certified or recertified a workable program or the community has submitted a request for such certification or recertification.

Technical assistance programs

Many Federal programs include technical assistance components. The types of technical assistance covered by the programs are quite varied in both content and definition. This discussion is confined to two programs that have been enacted in recent years specifically to provide technical assistance to communities under 50,000 population. These are the Urban Information and Technical Assistance program (Title IX of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966) and the Community Development Training program (Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1968).

The basic purpose of the Title IX program is to provide public management, technical assistance and information services to states and small communities (under 100,000) for the solution of community problems. A total of $2.2 million was appropriated in fiscal year 1968 for the program. The program was not funded separately in 1969 and 1970, however, but incorporated as a part of comprehensive planning assistance (701) program.

The Title VIII program provides grants for the training of technical, professional and sub-professional personnel of State and local public agencies with community development responsibilities and private non-profit organizations with responsibility for housing and community development. A total of $3 million has been appropriated annually since its establishment in 1968.

Both programs are administered by the states. In fiscal year 1968, some forty states applied for grants under the two programs. Many states are using the grants initially to strengthen their community affairs operations. In many states that have community affairs agencies, the Governor has designated these agencies to administer the Title VII and IX Programs. Statistical or other information is not available on the extent to which small communities nation-wide have benefited by the programs.

Physical development programs

A wide variety of programs are available to small communities which can be classified as physical development programs. These can be divided into the following program categories: (1) urban and rural

development; (2) housing; (3) water, sewer and waste treatment facilities; (4) community facilities; and (5) conservation and recreation.

Urban and Rural Development Programs

Urban Renewal Program.—This program provides grants, planning advances and temporary loans to eliminate blight in urban areas through surveys and planning, land acquisition and clearing, rehabilitation of existing structures, new building construction, and the installation of public improvements including streets and sidewalks, utilities, incidental recreational areas, flood protection, and the preservation of historic structures. A Federal grant of three-quarters of the cost is available to communities with a population of under 50,000. The community must have an adopted and certified workable program for community improvement and a feasible relocation plan. The project must also conform to a general plan for the development of the community as a whole.

Neighborhood Development Program (NDP).—In the Housing Act of 1968, the Federal government provided a new method of undertaking urban renewal plans and activities. Under the NDP, a contract for a loan or capital grant is made on an annual increment basis. The amount of the grant is the same as under the conventional program. A certified workable program for community improvement must also be in effect.

Demolition Grants.—Grants of up to a two-thirds of the actual cost are available to communities for use in selected areas to assist in demolishing structures that are structurally unsound or unfit for human habitation. A certified workable program for community development must also be in effect.

Code Enforcement Grants.—This program provides financial assistance to carry out three year concentrated code enforcement projects in selected areas where at least 20 percent of the buildings have code violations. Grants are provided for up to three-quarters of the cost for communities with a population of under 50,000. The program also provides financial assistance in the form of direct three percent interest loans and grants of up to $3,000 to eligible area residents. A certified workable program for community improvement must be in effect.

Grants for Interim Assistance.—This program provides grants to localities for interim assistance programs in slum and blighted areas which are planned for major renewal involving substantial clearance in the near future. Grants of up to three-quarters of the cost may be made to communities with populations of 50,000 or less. The community must have a certified workable program for community improvement in effect.

Rural Renewal Loans.—This program, administered by the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, provides loans and technical assistance to public agencies and private nonprofit organization in low-income areas designed as rural renewal areas. An overall rural renewal plan must be developed for the area prior to being eligible for loan assistance.

Urban Beautification.—This program provides grants to expand community activities in the beautification and improvement of pub-

licly-owned and controlled land in urban areas. Grants may equal up to 50 percent of the amount by which the applicant's expenditures in the current year for beautification and improvement activities exceed its usual annual expenditures for such activities. Grants may be used for park and recreation facilities and development, improvement of waterfronts, streetways, and squares, and the beautification and improvement of other public places. In order to be eligible for assistance, the public body must have officially adopted an overall beautification program consistent with local comprehensive planning.

Model Cities.—This program provides supplemental financial and technical assistance to enable cities to improve the quality of their physical and social environment. Model Cities grants may cover up to 80 percent of the cost of planning a comprehensive program attacking the social, economic and physical problems of blighted neighborhoods. Special grants supplementing assistance available under other Federal grant-in-aid programs can be used to finance innovative activities and projects in model neighborhoods. The special grant can be up to 80 percent of the total non-Federal contributions required for all federally aided activities comprising the model cities program of a city. A total of 150 cities have been designated as model cities under the program.

New Communities Program.—A considerable amount of interest has arisen in recent years concerning the concept of "new towns" and "new communities" although the concept itself is not new. An evaluation of this concept and its practical application is especially relevant for small communities. The Housing Act of 1968 under Title IV, "New Communities Act of 1968", for the first time provided for guarantees for financing new community land development. The Act was specifically designed to enlist new sources of private capital in the development of new communities. The program also authorized the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make supplementary grants to state and local bodies and agencies for water and sewer facilities and open space provided that the supplementary grants were desirable for carrying out a new community development project and that a substantial number of housing units for low and moderate income persons were made available through the project. Under the present legislation, only private developers are eligible to apply for the program.

Housing Programs

A wide variety of housing programs are available to small communities. The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture (USDA) administers the housing programs in rural areas which include open country and places with populations of not more than 5,500 which are rural in character and not closely associated with urban areas. The Department of Housing and Urban Development generally administers subsidized housing programs only in communities of 5,500 and over. All public housing programs are administered by HUD. The following program descriptions are limited to those programs available to communities and nonprofit and limited-dividend organizations and cooperative housing corporations. Federal Housing Administration (FHA) mortgage programs and individual programs from the Farmers Home Administration are not included.

The description of the programs has been divided into three categories: rental, homeownership, and special purpose housing programs.

Rental Housing Programs

Low Rent Public Housing (HUD).—This program was the first rental program authorized by the Federal Government under provisions of the Housing Act of 1937. The program provides financial and technical assistance to local housing authorities to plan, build, or acquire, own and operate low-rent public housing projects. Applicants must be local housing authorities or authorized public agencies. Some jurisdictions require that the Federal contract to support public housing projects be approved by local voters in referenda. Admission to public housing projects is restricted to families whose incomes are below limits established by the local housing authority under statutory Federal guidelines. However millions of families are too poor to even be eligible for the public housing program. The workable program prerequisite requirement for this program was removed with the passage of the Housing Act of 1969. A modification of the program known as the "turnkey" method allows a private developer to enter into a contract with the local housing authority for the construction of low rent public housing. The housing authority purchases the project upon completion.

Low Rent Public Housing—Leased (HUD).—This program provides annual contributions to authorized public agencies to work with real estate agencies, owners, and developers to provide housing for low-income families. Local authorities lease dwellings from private owners and make them available to low-income families at rents they can afford. The Federal share makes up the difference between what the owner receives and what the tenant-occupant pays. Local governing bodies must enact a resolution approving the use of the leasing program in the community.

Farm Labor Housing (USDA).—This program provides funds to be used to buy, build, or repair rental housing for domestic farm labor. Insured loans may be made to a farmowner, association of farmers, state or political subdivision, or nonprofit organization. Grants may be made to a state or political subdivision or a broadly-based nonprofit organization that will provide labor housing as a community service.

Rental Housing (Section 236) HUD.—The 236 program, part of the Housing Act of 1968, is designed to replace eventually both the 202 and 221 (d) (3) programs. Like the Rent Supplement program, it relies on private developers—both nonprofit and profit-oriented—of rental or cooperative housing. The subsidy technique is similar to that used in the Rent Supplement program with the tenant paying 25 percent of his income toward rent and the Federal government providing a supplement to make up the difference between a tenant's payment and market rents. Under the 236 program, the maximum Federal payment on a unit lowers the rent to the level which would be achieved had the project been financed with a one percent mortgage.

Rent Supplement Program (HUD).—Under this program, the tenant family pays 25 percent of its income towards rent, while the Federal government pays directly to the landlord the difference be-

tween economic rent levels and the tenant's contribution. Not all tenants in a project may be eligible for supplements. Eligibility requirements provide that a family must have a low income, few assets and be a member of one of the following deserving groups: elderly, handicapped, displaced by government action or natural disaster, or now living in substandard housing. Tenants who are not eligible for supplements pay the entire rent themselves. As a tenant's income rises, his supplement is reduced. Applicants may be nonprofit organizations, limited-dividend organizations and cooperative housing corporations.

Homeownership Housing Programs

Homeownership-Program (Section 235) HUD.—The Homeownership program, enacted in the Housing Act of 1968, is a major landmark in the history of Federal housing legislation. Prior to its enactment, all major housing subsidy programs were limited to rental units, with cooperative housing units permitted in a few instances. Under the program, the Federal government contracts to pay part of the homebuyer's mortgage payments. The maximum government subsidy reduces the homebuyer's payment to that which he would owe if his purchase had been financed with a mortgage bearing an interest rate of one percent. The amount of the subsidy varies according to the income of the homeowner and the total amount of the mortgage payment at the market rate of interest. Assistance under the program is generally limited to new or substantially rehabilitated units. The applicant may be anyone whose income qualifies him for the subsidy aid. Under a special agreement between HUD and the Department of Agriculture, both the Farmers Home Administration and the Federal Housing Administration have authority to originate cases and obligate assistance payments in rural areas and communities of 5,500 population or less.

Self-Help Housing (USDA).—This is a program in which individual houses are built under supervision by a group of families who will live in the dwellings. Loans are used to buy materials, pay for any skilled labor the families are unable to perform and, if necessary to buy building sites. The applicant must be a group of 6–10 low-income families that cannot individually afford to build modest houses by customary methods. HUD has a similar program called the "Mutual Help Program" which presently is available to Indian tribes.

Special Purpose Housing Programs

Senior Citizen Housing (HUD).—This program provides low-interest, long-term loans for new and rehabilitated rental housing for the elderly (62 years and older) and the handicapped. Private nonprofit and limited dividend corporations, consumer cooperatives, and public agencies (except local housing authorities receiving federal assistance under the Housing Act of 1937) are eligible.

Rental and Co-op Housing in Rural Areas (USDA).—This program provides loans to be used to build, buy, improve or repair rental housing for senior citizens who are capable of caring for themselves and other low or moderate income rural families. Applicants may be individuals, trusts, cooperatives, corporations, state or local governments or nonprofit sponsors.

70–132—71——6

Water, Sewer and Waste Treatment Facilities Programs

There are more Federal grant programs for water, sewer and waste treatment facilities than for any other single activity except housing. Five agencies—the Farmers Home Administration (Department of Agriculture), Federal Water Pollution Control Board (Department of Interior), Department of Housing and Urban Development, Economic Development Administration (Department of Commerce) and the Appalachian Regional Commission—make grants and loans for water, sewer and waste treatment facilities.

The Basic Water and Sewer Facilities Program (Section 702) of HUD provides grants to public bodies to cover one-half of the cost of construction of water and sewer facilities including sewage *collection* systems. Additional grant assistance may be given to applicants to make relocation payments to eligible individuals and families displaced by a project being assisted under the program. Like many Federal programs the difference between the amount authorized and appropriated during any given fiscal year has been considerable. For example, although $420 million was authorized in 1969, only $165 million was appropriated; in 1970, $535 million was authorized and only $135 million appropriated. At that time, HUD had a backlog of over 1,000 requests representing $498 million.[7]

The Farmers Home Administration program provides a maximum 50 percent grant to rural communities with populations of not more than 5,500 for water, sewer *and* waste treatment facilities. The FWPCA program provides grants to public bodies for 30 percent of the cost of waste treatment facilities (including interceptors and outfall sewers) with a ten percent bonus provided if a local comprehensive planning program is under way. Appalachian communities are eligible for an additional 20 percent if proposed projects are approved by the Regional Commission.

The Economic Development Administration makes grants to communities located in economic development areas for water and sewer facilities. Basic grants of up to 50 percent may be authorized and supplemental assistance is also available. However only supplemental assistance is available for sewage treatment plant facilities.

A variety of Federal loan programs are also available. The Farmers Home Administration may, in addition to grants, issue 10 percent loans for water, sewer and waste treatment plant facilities to those communities eligible for the grant program. The loans may be made for up to a 40-year period, with five percent interest rates. The Public Facility Loans of HUD for public bodies within SMSA's cover all water and sewer facilities *including* sewage treatment plant construction. Private nonprofit corporations are eligible, and coverage has been extended to privately developed new community projects. Loans are also available from the Economic Development Administration for water and sewer facilities but not for waste treatment plant construction.

Community Facilities Programs

Public Facility Loans.—This program provides long-term loans to finance the construction of needed public facilities. Eligible projects

[7] Bancroft, Raymond L., "Are the Cities Trapped In The Water Pollution Control Funding Gap?", *Nation's Cities*, (September, 1969), p. 12.

include construction of water and sewage facilities, gas distribution systems, streets, improvements, public buildings (except schools), recreation facilities, jails or other public works.

Neighborhood Facilities.—This program provides grants to aid in the construction and/or rehabilitation of multiservice neighborhood centers which offer a wide range of community services. Grants may be up to two-thirds of eligible development costs, or up to three-fourths in designated redevelopment areas authorized by the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce. The facility must be consistent with the development of a comprehensive plan for the community.

Conservation and Recreation Programs

Open Space Land.—This program provides grants to help communities acquire and develop land to help curb urban sprawl, to prevent the spread of urban blight, to encourage more economic and desirable urban development and to help provide needed park, recreation, conservation, scenic and historic areas. Grants may be made for up to 50 percent of the costs involved in acquiring land for open space use. Further grants up to 50 percent of the improvement costs for developing land acquired under the program may be made. As a prerequisite to open-space grant assistance there must be under way an areawide comprehensive planning program, a long-range open space planning program, a short-range open-space work program and existing local comprehensive planning for the area.

Historic Preservation Grants.—This program provides grants for the acquisition and restoration of historic sites or structures for the benefit of the public. Matching grants may be made up to 50 percent of the cost of acquiring, restoring or improving sites, structures or areas of historic or architectural significance. Projects must be in accord with comprehensive local planning and result in a public use or benefit.

Evaluation of Federal Programs

The evaluation of Federal programs and the conclusions and recommendations that follow are based upon an analysis of small community needs and problems as presented in Section IV, a review of current research on the subject, and discussions with regional, state and Federal officials. They are designed to provide, in a comprehensive manner, suggested courses of action to meet the particular needs and problems of smaller communities.

Federal program recommendations are of two types. The first group of recommendations concern modification of existing Federal programs in order to make them more responsive to small community needs. The second group of recommendations focus on two new programs which have been designed to specifically address the needs of small communities not covered under current legislation.

Recommendations for Modification of Existing Programs

An analysis of existing Federal programs in light of findings of this study indicates that several of the programs should be modified in order to better meet the needs of small communities. These include

programs in all three of the major categorical areas: planning assistances, technical assistance, and physical development.

It should be noted that the specific program recommendations made here refer to the utilization of the programs by small communities. It may well be that the recommended modifications are also applicable to larger communities. This subject, which is outside of the scope of the present study, would be a logical counterpart to it however.

Modifications to the following programs are recommended below: Comprehensive Planning Assistance, the Workable Program, Technical Assistance, Housing, Water, Sewer and Waste Treatment, and New Communities.

Comprehensive Planning Assistance Program

The Comprehensive Planning Assistance Program has undergone some major policy and administrative revisions since 1969, many of which are a result of a study entitled *Comprehensive Planning Assistance in the Small Community.*[8] In recognition of the criticism in recent years that most plans have been primarily if not entirely confined to physical characteristics and problems, greater emphasis has been put on social concerns, including housing, citizen participation, and the provision of public services to minority groups and the poor. A "housing element" is now required as part of the preparation of comprehensive land use plans and the element must be continually updated to receive continuing planning assistance under the program. The types of activities eligible for assistance have also been expanded considerably and now include such items as studies and analyses of social and economic conditions; governmental structures; financial and personnel resources; local codes; public services in general; and many others.

The administration of the "701" program has also undergone some major changes. Prior to the revisions, individual applications for funding were submitted by the community to the state where they were reviewed, and when approved, forwarded to the regional HUD office for yet another review and approval. Applications were then submitted to HUD's central office in Washington for funding. HUD's new concept is to encourage more state involvement in the planning process and at the same time help in eliminating some of the administrative "red tape" in the processing of planning applications. Under the new concept, annual block grants are made to states based on the approval of work programs delineating the estimated cost of planning grants and assistance to communities for the ensuing year.

The move toward annual bloc grants is seen by HUD officials as serving several purposes. The first will implement an original provision in the 1954 Housing Act for encouraging state programs of planning assistance. The change will also recognize statewide planning as a continuous process, rather than as a series of unrelated local projects. Finally, the annual grant processing is expected to reduce HUD paperwork connected with the "701" program by almost 60 percent. In 1968, for example, HUD had to process close to 1,000 applications for grant assistance that originated with communities of less than

[8] Hammer, Greene, Siler Associates, *Comprehensive Planning Assistance in the Small Community,* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, March, 1969).

50,000 population. Under the new system the planning assistance needs can be met, hopefully, through no more than 50 applications for small communities.[9]

It would be premature to attempt to evaluate the results of the recent changes made in the comprehensive planning assistance program. It does appear however that HUD has made a concerted effort to overcome many of the criticisms made about the program over the years.

There are however some additional changes that should be considered to make the program an even more effective planning tool for small communities. These are basically concerned with three areas: (1) the content of the plan itself; (2) the development of better mechanisms to ensure planning on a continuing basis; and (3) the requirement of a comprehensive plan for all communities under 50,000.

Comprehensive Development Plan.—The majority of the communities visited had comprehensive plans. A review of the plans indicated the following limitations: (1) the majority of basic statistical data was taken from the 1960 Federal census. In most instances no updating of especially significant factors such as housing and employment indices has been completed; (2) planning was too long-range and of too general a nature to be implementable. Many of the plans provided for no intermediate guidelines as to steps that should be taken immediately to move toward final objectives; (3) some reports were voluminous documents crammed with statistical and other material of little practical value to the community; (4) the time to complete the plan averaged between 18–24 months making it difficult to sustain citizen participation and interest; (5) some reports were largely recitations of planning standards and principles with few proposals directed specifically at the problems and needs of the community studies. One planning study of a community with a high percentage of persons over 65 and a fairly large minority population contained no references to either group.

Many of these findings have been confirmed in other studies. HUD has worked toward overcoming them by explicitly recognizing and encouraging the importance of a continuing planning process. This study feels however that further modifications have to be made in the planning process itself through more specific differentiation between development of the initial or preliminary plan and continuing planning studies. The initial or preliminary planning effort should start with a general analysis of the community considering its governmental, economic, physical and social characteristics and the pertinent problems and needs in each area. This would be a much more in-depth study than the present reconnaisance study made by the state prior to approval of an application for "701" funding. As a result of the analysis, community objectives and goals would be formulated and priorities established for their eventual implementation. A three to five year work program would then be prepared to implement the first set of priorities that could be realistically expected to be completed within the time period. Those items with lesser priority would be incorporated into future work programs as part of the continuing planning process.

---

[9] "Bloc Grants to States Being Tested By HUD Through Section 701 Planning Assistance," *The Journal of Housing* (March, 1969), pp. 120–121.

The continuing planning phase would commence after community adoption of the preliminary plan and would be involved with implementation of the work program. Detailed studies of major subject areas identified during the preliminary plan such as housing, transportation, park and recreation facilities, etc. would be undertaken during this period. The present detailed study of housing needs (referred to as the "housing element") would not be required unless the preliminary plan indicated that housing was a significant community problem or need. In such cases, a detailed study would be done as part of the continuing planning process.

Under the proposal suggested above, the orientation of the community planning process would be changed from the producing of a static plan that anticipates and attempts to accommodate all future development and changed in one document to that of a continuing planning process. The time to complete the preliminary plan should not take more than six months to one year. Sections of the plan could be adopted as completed which would help in providing continuing citizen interest and participation. The preliminary plan as proposed here should be a required prerequisite for all HUD public housing and community development programs.

Recommendation No. 1.—The community planning process should be reoriented and divided into two distinct parts: (1) preparation of a preliminary plan which would include an overall analysis of the community, formulation of long-range objectives and goals, establishment of priorities and preparation of a work program to carry them out; and (2) detailed studies of major subject areas identified during the preliminary plan and included in the work program.

Recommendation No. 2.—The preparation and adoption of a preliminary plan should be a prerequisite for all HUD Public housing and community development programs.

Continuing Planning Assistance.—Needless to say, no comprehensive plan has much value unless permanent planning machinery is available to see that the document is implemented and continually reviewed in response to changing conditions. This factor, probably more than any other has been one of the major weaknesses of the "701" comprehensive plan in small communities. Of the thirty-six communities visited during the study, only seven had their own professional planning staff. Three additional cities were part of a city-county planning agency which had professional staffs. Although figures were not available on the percentage of cities under 50,000 population with professional planners, it is obviously small. With this fact in mind, it is little wonder that many plans merely end up occupying space on the bookshelf. As indicated previously, over $50 million has been appropriated for planning assistance to small communities and counties up to 1967. If these funds are to be used to the best possible advantage, some method should be devised to ensure that responsibility for and professional assistance in carrying out the provisions of the plan are available.

States have taken various approaches in an attempt to see that communities provide for continuing planning assistance. For example, the state of Virginia feels that communities must make a concrete commitment to continuous planning. It enforces this belief by accept-

ing applications only from municipalities which have a full-time planner. The State does, however, supply planning assistance to smaller communities with its own staff.

HUD at the present time does not require that planning assistance be available to carry out the development plan. However, various requirements were in effect prior to the last revision of the Comprehensive Planning Assistance Handbook which required full-time city planners in cities over 25,000 population and the presence of either a planning consultant or an area-wide organization to carry out the plan in cities under this size. The requirement was reportedly deleted because there are not enough planners in the country to realistically meet this provision.

The fact remains, however, that the preparation of planning documents are of little value if the proposals are not implemented. It should therefore seem reasonable to require that communities in submitting an application for planning assistance funds indicate that (1) an individual on the city administrative staff has been assigned the responsibility to administer the implementation of the planning study proposals and that (2) professional planning assistance is available from either the city staff, county, regional or state planning agencies, or a private consulting firm. Since occasional professional planning services may be necessary to administer various aspects of the plan, expenses for such services should be specifically recognized as an eligible activity under the comprehensive planning assistance program.

***Recommendation No. 3.*—Requirements should be formulated by HUD to require that applicants for "701" funding submit evidence that responsibility for implementation of the plan has been assigned to a specific individual on the city staff and that professional assistance in implementing the plan will be available from either the city staff, county, regional or state planning agencies, or a private consulting firm.**

***Recommendation No. 4.*—Activities eligible for funding under the Comprehensive Planning Assistance program should be expanded to provide specifically for continuing professional planning assistance in administering local plans.**

Area-Wide Versus Individual Comprehensive Plans.—Many small rural communities do not need individual comprehensive plans nor do they have the management capability to utilize the plans properly. In non-metropolitan areas with relatively small populations (generally under 25,000 with emphasis under 15,000), it may be more efficient and as effective to perform comprehensive planning on an area-wide basis in place of preparing a plan for each individual commumnity within the area. When a county or regional planning agency (including a non-metropolitan planning district) exists which has the capability to prepare a comprehensive plan for the communities within its jurisdiction as part of an area-wide plan, such a plan should be encouraged in lieu of the development of plans by a number of individual small communities.

If the area-wide plan meets the new requirements for comprehensive planning recommended in this study, it should be acceptable as a prerequisite for Federal program requests by the communities in the planning district.

Recommendation No. 5.—**The preparation of area- wide rather than individual community comprehensive plans for small nonmetropolitan communities (generally under 25,000 with emphasis under 15,000) should be encouraged.**

Workable Program for Community Improvement

The advisability of retaining the workable program requirement as a prerequisite for a number of federal programs, especially those associated with public housing, has been the subject of much debate in the last few years. Although the requirement has now been removed from public housing programs, it is useful to restate the pro and con arguments concerning its validity.

The Douglas Commission in its report *Building the American City* felt that the workable program had been largely responsible for the growth in the number of cities with housing codes. It further noted that it could find no support for the view often expressed by opponents that the program is an insurmountable roadblock to public housing. In addition to recommending its retention, the Commission proposed that it be tied to all federal housing and development aids, including FHA and water and sewer grants, with communities required to provide low-income housing before they can receive the other grants. In making the recommendation, the Commission stated that although "a workable program for, say water and sewer facilities might differ somewhat from the . . . one for renewal and low-income housing . . . the need for . . . encouraging a hard look around and ahead is scarcely less urgent for water and sewer projects than for renewal." [10]

The National Housing Conference in its 1968 resolutions, on the other hand called for the repeal of the workable program requirement for all housing programs. This view was shared by the Kaiser Committee which stated: "We have concluded that regardless of the Workable Program's positive intent, its practical result has been to severely restrict the number of sites available for Federally subsidized housing. Communities opposed to subsidized housing within their boundaries can effectively block private developers by failing to conform to the Workable Program requirement." [11]

As indicated in the small community profiles, the majority of the communities felt that the basic intent and purpose of the program was good. A number mentioned that the community would not have adopted modern codes and hired building inspectors to provide effective code enforcement without the requirement.

There were however various criticisms of the program. Feelings were expressed that the program had in effect become a statistical exercise in trying to impress HUD with the number of inspections made, dwellings condemned, etc. Several officials indicated that HUD representatives had encouraged them to juggle figures to either make the statistics look more impressive or come up to the "standard" expected for the community. Others indicated that strict enforcement of the codes was unrealistic since it would result in the condemning of a sub-

---

[10] Report of the National Commission on Urban Problems, *Building The American City*, (Washington, D.C., Goverment Printing Office, December, 1968), pp. 61–63.
[11] Report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing, *A Decent Home*, (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, December, 1968), pp. 30–31.

stantial portion of the residential community if carried out. Comments were also made that until the community's urban renewal application was approved, the city could not condemn properties. In other instances, strict enforcement was out of the question since sufficient vacant land and unoccupied residential structures were not available to house those removed from their existing homes. There were also doubts expressed about the purpose and meaningfulness of some of the items on the application form itself. Officials in smaller communities felt that there was not a sufficient differentiation between the requirements they had to meet as contrasted with those of larger communities with more critical problems and more professional and technical city staff.

The workable program has four major requirements which communities must satisfy in order to receive initial certification or recertification. These are the following: (1) adoption of codes and establishment of an effective code enforcement program; (2) development of an effective, continuing planning and programming process to help overcome major problems of slum and blighted areas; (3) analysis and progress towards correcting community housing needs including the preparation of an effective relocation program; and (4) citizen involvement in HUD renewal and housing programs.

The development of a more effective and meaningful continuing planning process has been discussed above and recommendations made to achieve this result. The workable program requirement in this regard would be met through the revised planning process. A general analysis of housing and other slum and blighted conditions would be made during the preliminary plan. If, as a result of this study, it was apparent that needs in this area were of paramount importance, they would be explored more fully during the next phase of the planning process through in-depth studies. A relocation plan would likewise be prepared at this time. Citizen involvement would of course be retained as a vital part of the continuing planning process. In essence, therefore, three of the four present requirements of the workable program would be met through the continuing planning process.

The adoption and updating of codes, and the establishment of an effective codes enforcement has probably been the most controversial aspect of the workable program. As indicated above, opponents of the workable program have indicated that its practical result has been to restrict the building of federally subsidized housing. It is suggested that housing programs continue to be exempted from code requirements until sufficient time has passed to actually determine if the program has in effect been the obstacle it was claimed to be. The establishment of adequate codes and a code enforcement program however should continue to be a prerequisite for urban renewal programs.

The workable program for community improvements should, in short, be eliminated with the exception that code adoption and the creation of an effective code enforcement program should continue to be required for urban renewal programs.

This study recommends the establishment of a "codes improvement program" in its place, specifically designed to encourage and provide assistance to small communities in adopting codes and providing a

codes enforcement program. Since this study has shown that the primary need for greater financial and technical assistance is located in communities of 25,000 population or less, it is recommended that the program be limited to cities of this size.

The proposed program would provide technical assistance to communities in adopting and updating codes and in providing training for local inspectors. Both programs should be administered by the states. Fundings for such assistance could come from the comprehensive planning assistance and community development training programs, both of which are currently administered at the state level. Financial assistance should also be provided to hire and retain inspectors for the codes enforcement program. Such assistance however should be available only to those communities that could show sufficient evidence of inability to finance the costs out of their local budgets. The states should finance this portion of the program.

Recommendation No. 6.—The requirement for a workable program for community improvement as previously constituted should be discontinued. However, the adoption of codes and establishment of an effective codes enforcement program should continue to be required prior to the acceptance of an application for urban renewal programs.

Recommendation No. 7.—A "Codes Improvement Program" specifically designed for communities of 25,000 and under should be created to assist cities of this size in the adoption and updating of codes, and in the establishment of a codes enforcement program. The program should be administered by the states. Technical assistance should be available to aid communities in codes preparation and the training of inspectors. Financial assistance should be provided by states to finance the cost of hiring inspectors to implement the codes enforcement program.

Technical Assistance Programs to Small Communities

It is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of the Urban Information and Technical Assistance (Title IX) and Community Development Training (Title VIII) programs for several reasons. Neither program has been in existence for a long enough time to furnish sufficient indication of its performance. Second, funds for both programs have been limited; in fact, the Title IX program was not funded for two years. Only a very few of the thirty-six communities visited have been the beneficiary of activities under either program.

The basic intent of both programs has been to assist smaller communities by providing a variety of technical assistance and training development programs. The results of this study have confirmed a major need for such technical assistance on the part of small communities. The basic intent of both of these programs to deliver such assistance through the states continues to appear valid, and, with the modification suggested below, it is recommended that a significant effort be devoted to increasing the size of these two programs.

Both technical assistance programs were originally available to communities under 100,000 in population. Since the Urban Information and Technical Assistance program has been made a part of the Comprehensive Planning Assistance program (701), the population limit has been reduced to 50,000. An analysis of the results of this study

indicates, however, that communities under 25,000 are usually the ones, which because of limited staff and training capabilities, have the greatest need for such technical assistance. It is recommended, therefore, that both the Information and Technical Assistance and Community Development Training programs be used primarily to assist communities of 25,000 population or less.

***Recommendation No. 8.*—Technical Assistance and Community Development Training programs should be substantially increased and used primarily to assist communities of 25,000 population or less.**

Housing Programs

As the study has already substantiated, housing is one of the major problems confronting the small community. Census figures for 1960 estimated that three-fifths or 60 percent of the 11 million substandard and over-crowded dwelling units in the United States are in rural areas—generally on farms and in towns of less than 2,500 persons. Thirty-six percent of all rural housing is substandard, compared with the estimates of 10 percent of all urban housing. These statistics emphasize the importance of housing programs for small communities, particularly those in nonurban areas.

An analysis of housing in the small communities visited in this study, shows that little use has been made of the newer Federal housing subsidy programs—Section 235 (homeownership), Section 236 (rental) and the rent supplement program. These programs furnish an essential mechanism for providing moderate income housing and an additional source of low income housing. Yet a number of communities were unaware of these programs, which indicates a need to improve the methods of publicizing them.

However, there appears to be even more important deterrent to the use of these programs in small communities. Each of the programs requires a non-public developer in the form of a limited-dividend developer, a non-profit organization, or a cooperative. In a number of the communities visited, developers willing to undertake subsidy housing programs could not be identified. In order to increase the number of subsidy housing programs in small communities it will be necessary to design other mechanisms to attract developers. This might take several forms such as incentives to big city developers to produce subsidy housing projects in small communities; or provision for joint public-private development groups, with the local governments taking a major role in organizing and participating in development corporations.

A second major constraint in the development of subsidized housing in many small, particularly rural, communities is the lack of financing through local banking institutions. A number of the banks in small communities do not have the financial resources or lending policies which will provide funds for what are essentially high risk ventures. Again, there are a number of alternative means for providing financing for subsidized housing programs which should be explored. These might include the placement of state treasury funds in local banks on the condition that they will use the money to finance housing and other development projects—a technique which is being

used successfully in Illinois. It might also include the establishment of a national housing development bank.

A study should be made of the institutional requirements for subsidized housing programs to determine the best alternative means for developing such projects in small communities.

Recommendation No. 9.—HUD should conduct a study of the present methods for attracting developers and financing for subsidized housing programs to determine whether other mechanisms would be more effective in increasing the use of these programs in small communities.

As indicated previously, both HUD and the Farmers Home Administration administer housing programs in small communities. Farmers Home Administration is generally responsible for programs in rural areas of less than 5,500 population. Since its establishment, Farmers Home Administration has been primarily involved with providing housing loans to individual farmers and others in rural areas.

Additional responsibilities were given to Farmers Home Administration under the Housing Acts of 1968 and 1969. The Housing Act of 1968 gave the agency authority to provide direct and insured loans for housing in rural areas to low and moderate income persons and to provide rental or cooperative housing for such persons where assistance is not available under the new interest reduction programs authorized by law (sections 235 and 236). The Act also authorized a new program of grants and loans to provide assistance in rural areas and small towns to needy low-income individuals and their families for mutual or self-help housing. Farmers Home Administration's only other grant program is the farm labor housing program. The 1969 Housing Act gave the agency authority to make or insure loans to nonprofit organizations to provide sites for rural housing for low and moderate income families. The Act also gave Farmers Home Administration the authority to initiate a conditional commitment program that will permit it to finance small subdivision-type housing developments. Previously, the agency could finance building of new homes only on a single-unit-at-a-time basis.

Concern has been expressed by some that the presence of two Federal agencies with housing responsibilities cannot be justified. One recent study made the following comments:

> There is overlapping of jurisdiction between FHA and HUD. In given situations each department may apply different criteria. There are frequent delays; and the maze of redtape is frustrating to the applicant. With authority divided there is always the danger that the programs in neither department will be funded adequately.[12]

The study went on to recommend that rural housing programs be centralized in one department although the name of the specific agency was not designated.

A Federal Task Force Report in October 1969 recommended to the House Committee on Banking and Currency that an Office of Assistant Secretary for Rural housing be established within HUD.[13] This recommendation has since been withdrawn.

---

[12] President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, *The People Left Behind*, (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 97.

[13] Hearings, House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency, October 6, 1969.

There may be some validity to the criticism that there is overlapping between the two agencies in programs to assist individual homeowners. Farmers Home Administration, however, has functioned generally as the residual supplier of credit in rural areas. If the applicant requesting credit can get it from another source, the agency is usually not involved. At the same time, HUD is the only agency with *public housing* programs.

The study, in short, could not find substantial evidence to support the position that housing programs should be centralized in one agency. It does however encourage the continuation of efforts by the joint task force committee (HUD–USDA Rural Housing Task Force) set up to coordinate programs between the two agencies.

Water, Sewer and Waste Treatment Programs

In order to coordinate Federal water, sewer and waste treatment assistance programs and to assist applicants, the Bureau of the Budget developed a standard form (Form 101) for inquiries concerning financial assistance for water and sewer projects and waste treatment facilities. Interested communities submit their preliminary inquiries to either the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Housing and Urban Development which refers the form to the Economic Developmental Administration if the project is in an area eligible for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act. If the inquiry is for waste treatment facilities, it is referred to the Federal Water Pollution Control Board (FWPCB). Inquiries concerning grants for waste treatment facilities may also be filed with the appropriate state water pollution control agency.

The Interagency Committee to Provide Continuing Coordination for Water and Sewer Programs was established in 1965 with representation on the committee from the four departments having basic water and sewer grant-in-aid programs. The mission of the committee is to develop more simplified and consistent methods and procedures which will improve the effectiveness of the programs both for Federal agencies and applicants.

Although the Federal government has attempted to coordinate the various water, sewer and waste treatment facility programs, there still apparently is considerable confusion among communities as to which agency has responsibility. Although, for example, Federal legislation states that communities in rural areas of under 5,500 are supposed to receive funds from the Farmers Home Administration, HUD apparently can also accept applications from such communities. The determining factor in many cases involves the availability of uncommitted funds. There are a number of other interesting differences between programs in the various agencies. Although HUD can give supplemental assistance to communities, Farmers Home Administration cannot; although HUD is prohibited from giving grants for waste treatment facilities, it can give loans for such facilities under the Public Facility Loan program. Farmers Home Administration, however, is authorized to give both grants and loans for water, sewer and waste treatment facilities. Although the FWPCB can give grants for construction of waste treatment facilities, it cannot make loans for the

same purpose. EDA on the other hand can make both basic and supplemental grants as well as loans for water and sewer projects but only supplemental grant assistance for waste treatment facilities.

In recognition of this obvious problem of overlapping responsibilities and considerable confusion in the administration of the programs, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations proposed in "The Water and Sewer Facilities Grant and Loan Consolidation Act of 1969" that the following amendments be made: (1) repeal of the authority for Farmers Home Administration and the Economic Development Administration to make grants or loans for basic public water and sewer facilities or waste treatment works; (2) retention by EDA and the Appalachian Regional Commission of their supplementary grant programs to make loans supplementing HUD and FWPCB grants and loans; (3) authority of the FWPCB to make loans for waste treatment works; (4) increase of the maximum Federal contribution for waste treatment works from 30 to 35 percent; (5) addition of areawide functional and comprehensive planning conformance requirements identical with those in existing HUD grant programs to both the FWPCB grant and loan programs.

The measure in short would provide for concentrating all direct grant and loan programs for water and sewer facilities and waste treatment works in two agencies—HUD and Interior (Federal Water Pollution Control Board). HUD would be assigned the responsibility for administering grants and loans for basic water and sewer facilities. FWPCB would be given responsibility for all waste treatment works (including interceptor and outfall sewers). Authorizations for the Department of Agriculture and Economic Development Administration would be repealed or amended to ensure that they would have no grant or loan authority in these areas. EDA and the Appalachian Regional Commission would however still have authority to make supplementary grants.

During the visits to the study communities, a number of instances were encountered where water or sewer facilities had been constructed by one Federal agency within the corporate limits and another outside the city. This study could find little justification for continuing to have water and sewer programs divided among five Federal agencies and therefore endorses the enactment of the Water and Sewer Facilities Grant and Loan Consolidation Act of 1969.

***Recommendation No. 10.*—The Water and Sewer Facilities Grant and Loan Consolidation Act of 1969 providing for HUD responsibility for administering grants and loans for basic water and sewer facilities and Interior responsibility for all waste treatment works should be enacted by Congress. The Economic Development Administration and the Appalachian Regional Commission should retain authority to make supplemental grants.**

New Communities Program

The new communities program was developed to provide living space for the 100,000,000 Americans who will be added to the population by the year 2000. As of October, 1969, approximately 32 new community proposals had been submitted to HUD under the New

Communities Act of 1968. Only two call for creating new towns from an existing small community base and only one, Jonathan, is located in a county currently classified as being non-metropolitan.

HUD should strongly favor new community developments in non-metropolitan areas. It should also encourage the development of new communities from existing communities which are or have the potential for being growth centers. This would accomplish two things. First, it would achieve one of the major objectives of the program which is to prevent the continuing incremental growth of metropolitan areas. Second, the degree of risk in constructing a new community in a non-metropolitan area would be lessened if the community were supported by the resources and capabilities of an existing community. Obviously, the selection of such a community must be based upon an assessment of its growth potential. The results of this study indicate that a number of such communities exist in rural areas. Through the use of study techniques similar to the analysis of small communities in this project, it should be possible for Federal and state officials to identify "seed" communities around which future new towns can be developed.

Recommendation No. 11.—HUD should encourage the development of new communities in nonmetropolitan areas. Such communities preferably should be constructed around existing seed communities with growth potential. Federal and state officials should identify potential seed communities through study techniques similar to those used in this study.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW PROGRAMS

In analyzing the needs of small communities, there are two developmental areas which are not covered by existing Federal programs. Two new programs, therefore, are recommended to round out the range of planning assistance, technical assistance, and physical development programs designed to assist small communities.

The first of the new programs relates to a comprehensive program of small community development, while the second concerns a new program of public facility grants.

Small Community Development Program

In the previous section on the new communities program, one method for providing for the growth and development of future urban centers was described. However, it can readily be appreciated that the new communities approach to small community development can be applied only in a limited number of cases due to the particular circumstances of the program which require a private developer and the relatively small amount of funds available for loan guarantees.

As the analysis of the small communities in this study reveals, there are a number of communities which have significant potential for future growth and development, which do not have the financial capacity for developing themselves. If the means for a comprehensive program of development for these communities were designed, a second approach to the development of new centers of urban growth

could be taken. In this instance, the local government, itself, would become the developer for the community. It would analyze its needs and problems, prepare a comprehensive community development plan, and proceed with a total redevelopment of the community with the financial support of the Federal government.

The Small Community Development Program would generally operate in the following manner. A community would prepare an action plan listing the major problems and needs inhibiting its growth and development. The plan would be similar to the State of Connecticut's "community development action plan." The plan would preferably be an outgrowth of studies completed under the comprehensive planning assistance program. The states would provide technical assistance in developing the plan for those communities which did not have sufficient technical resources of their own.

The proposed program, as a demonstration program, would be available to communities of 15,000 population or less which were located in non-metropolitan areas. This study has concluded that communities of this population size and under are in the vast majority of instances those that have the greatest need for financial assistance. Municipalities would not however be automatically eligible to receive assistance under this program.

A determination would initially be made by HUD that the applicant community had growth potential to ensure future economic viability. Second, sufficient evidence would have to be submitted to indicate that the community did not have the financial resources to implement the proposed development plan.

For those projects in the development plan for which there are existing programs, basic grants would come from the Federal agency administering the program as is presently the case. If a Federal program to meet the particular requirements of the community does not exist, the project would be funded from supplemental bloc grant development funds administered by HUD. Supplemental assistance would also be available to bring the total amount of the grants for each program up to 100 percent of the cost of the project. Consideration should also be given to having the states share in the financial cost of the program.

The program in short would operate in similar fashion to the model cities program. It would give the communities the opportunity to come up with their own programs to solve problems and needs inhibiting growth and development. The concept of an overall plan of action will also give communities the opportunity for an "over-view" of community development needs, in contrast to the present approach of selective development projects on the basis of existing Federal categorical programs.

Recommendation No. 12.—A small Community Development Program should be established as a demonstration program for non-metropolitan communities of 15,000 population and under which would provide grants of up to 100 percent to finance needed community development projects and programs.

Eligibility in the program would be limited to those communities with future growth potential that could show limited local resources to finance the programs on their own.

Public Facilities Program

No Federal grant-in-aid programs are presently available to small communities for the construction of city administrative buildings, such at city halls, or for public safety facilities. The Public Facility Loan program provides funds for such purposes but only on a long-term loan basis. The Neighborhood Facilities program is specifically designed to provide grants to communities for the construction of multipurpose facilities for health, welfare, social, educational, cultural and recreational services in the neighborhood. The only exceptions where grant assistance is available for administrative and public safety facilities is in connection with an urban renewal project or where an emergency operations center is to be incorporated into such a facility. Federal grants for construction of police facilities may also be obtained under the Safe Streets Act although they are not being encouraged at the present time.

A number of communities visited lacked adequate administrative and public safety facilities. The need for such facilities was especially critical in communities under 15,000 population. Ten of the thirteen communities of under 15,000 population that the study team visited were in need of either better administrative and public safety facilities or both. In most instances, the communities financial capacity prohibited them from being able to accumulate sufficient funds for the construction of new facilities. The communities had limited bonding capacities in addition to the fact that annual bonded debt repayments would put an additional burden on residents with already limited incomes.

It is therefore recommended that a program be created to provide grants of up to 50 percent to communities of 15,000 population or under for the construction of administrative and public safety facilities. In order to encourage the construction of joint facilities to serve more than one governmental agency, supplemental assistance up to an additional 30 percent for a total grant of 80 percent should be provided where more than one of the local governments in the area join together to build a common facility. An example would be the construction of a combined city-county administrative facility such as was done in Lebanon, Pennsylvania, one of the thirty-six communities visited during the study.

***Recommendation No. 13.*—HUD should establish a program designed to provide grants of 50 percent to communities under 15,000 population for the construction of administrative and public safety facilities. Supplemental assistance up to an additional 30 percent should also be allowed in cases where more than one of the local governments in a community join together to construct a common facility.**

Administration of Federal Programs

SMALL TOWN SERVICES PROGRAM

Since the establishment of HUD in 1965, the House Small Business Committee and the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and HUD Appropriations have urged the Department to set up an office to concentrate on the problems of smaller towns. Congressman Joe L. Evins

70-132—71——7

(D-Tenn.) encouraged President Lyndon Johnson to undertake "a national concentrated effort to strengthen small-town America" (Congressional Record, January 22, 1968, p. E100). During the Executive Reorganization hearings of the Senate Committee on Government operations in 1966 the small community question was also raised:

In the formulation of the Department we expressed great concern over whether the small community would be overlooked. What have you done, and what are you proposing to do, in behalf of the small community?

In late 1967, a Small Communities Branch in the Division of the State-Local Relations, Office of Intergovernmental Relations, was organized to develop a program of liaison to analyze activities dealing with the unique problems and needs of smaller communities. To underscore and strengthen activities to familiarize small towns with HUD programs, a Special Assistant was appointed by the Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development. A major reorganization of the Office of Metropolitan Development in October 1968 created a new Office of Small Town Services, reporting directly to the Assistant Secretary.

The objectives and functions of the Office of Small Town Services were defined as follows:

A. *Objectives.*—

1. To sharpen HUD's focus on small community problems and improve the delivery of Federal programs to smaller communities;

2. To develop and improve lines of communications between Federal, State, and small town governments in order to understand better the housing and urban development problems of smaller communities and their implications for Federal program and policy administration;

3. To develop and help shape a viable Federal policy to guide decisions as they relate to the allocation of Federal resources for smaller communities; and

4. To stimulate, monitor, conduct, and evaluate studies that deal with the problems and special needs of small communities.

B. *Functions.*—

1. To provide assistance and advice to small towns in support of HUD's missions through correspondence, liaison, surveys, special studies, conferences, meetings, etc.

2. To encourage and carry out, to the extent practicable, systematic study and analysis of small communities and identified problem areas. Study findings will be reviewed and appropriate recommendations urged for the various programs administered by the Department.

3. To identify and coordinate activities dealing with the small community carried on by the various program areas in HUD as well as by other Federal agencies (e.g. Agriculture, Labor, EDA, OEO, SBA, etc.). To investigate the establishment of a coordinating mechanism for the various Federal agencies administering programs affecting smaller communities.

4. To participate in general government group activities, departmental and intergovernmental special task groups and committees, and to consult with State and small community officials in order to better define the problems and needs of small communities.

5. To spearhead the planning and staging of national, regional and State conferences, workshops, and seminars on small community de-

velopment. Emphasis will be on the identification and solution of small community housing and development problems.

6. To coordinate with the Urban Management Assistance Administration program staff to identify and analyze the unique planning and management needs of small community governmental units. New and improved techniques to service the small town will be explored on a continuing basis and ways to promote the adoption and application of these will be investigated.[14]

In March 1970, in a second reorganization of the Office of Metropolitan Development, the Office of Small Town Services was combined with a number of other programs under a new organizational unit designated as the Office of Small Town Services and Intergovernmental Relations. The new Office in addition to Small Town Services, has the responsibility for the following programs: Community Development Training Program (Title VIII), State-Local Relations, the Urban Clearinghouse, Urban Fellowship Program and Technical Assistance to State and Local Governments.

An evaluation of the functions of the Small Town Services program has been made as part of this study. Since the Office has just been reorganized, the question of the placement of the program within the HUD central administrative structure has not been analyzed. This would require an extensive analysis of the assignment of organizational responsibilities within HUD—a subject beyond the scope of this study.

The results of this study clearly indicate a need for a program of assistance and services for small communities. As extensively documented in previous sections of this report, small communities have distinct needs for information and technical assistances which are significantly different than those of larger jurisdictions. The particular needs and problems of small communities must also be considered at the Federal policy and administrative management levels. Finally, if small communities are to play a significant role in the future urban development of America, considerably more research and study needs to be done on a national policy of urban growth and development in nonmetropolitan areas.

An analysis of the impact of the Small Town Services program to date indicates that a good deal more needs to be done to effectively meet the requirements outlined above. The area in which the program has probably been most successful is in its role as representative of small communities within the Federal government. One of the major contributions that the program has made in this regard has been through the Joint HUD-USDA Rural Housing Task force which meets to coordinate housing policies and procedures between the two agencies with regard to small rural communities.

However, the program's role in the other major functional areas of concern has been limited by a very small staff and budget. The study found that a majority of the small communities visited and even some HUD regional staff were not aware of the Small Town Services pro-

[14] Office of Small Town Services, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, "Statement of Background, Mission and Program for Office of Small Town Services," (Washington, D.C., December, 1969).

gram. An increase in the program will be necessary if it is to really be effective in its role of providing assistance to small communities. Consideration should be given to providing for the program function at the regional level.

A lack of information about the program will undoubtedly be alleviated with the recent production of a film strip about small communities. However, much more needs to be done in producing information packages which will be useful to small communities and to Federal and state staff who deal with small communities. Finally, the development of a data base for small communities has just begun. This study has produced a methodology for investigating small community needs, problems, resources, and capabilities. But the general study data produced is for only thirty-six communities. Comparable information on even the use of Federal programs in small communities does not now exist. The Small Town Services program should take the lead in urging the development of a basic data profile system for small communities, to be used as a research tool and as a source of information for other Federal agencies, state agencies, and the small communities, themselves.

Lastly, the size of the communities on which the Small Town Services program should focus its efforts has been studied. Currently, the program uses a standard of any community under 50,000 (the upper limit of this study). With the exception of the Community Development Training program, this is the upper limit for most Federal programs which have a small community concern or special provision. However, the results of this study strongly indicate that there is a more marked difference between communities under and above 25,000, than under and above 50,000. There is a second, less definitive, break about 15,000. The program recommendations made in the study focus on these two lower levels rather than limit of 50,000.

In reviewing the four functions of the program, it would seem most reasonable to use the two levels of 25,000 and 50,000. Informational services, interagency program coordination, and small community research and data collation should concentrate on communities under 25,000. Assistance and advice to small towns which request help should continue to be made available to communities up to 50,000.

Recommendation No. 14.—**The functions and responsibilities of the Small Town Services program should continue to involve the four major program areas: (1) informational assistance; (2) general assistance and advice; (3) interagency coordination; and (4) research.**

Recommendation No. 15.—**The Small Town Services program should be augmented in order to be more effective in assisting small communities. Consideration should be given to the establishment of the program function at the regional level.**

Recommendation No. 16.—**The Small Town Services program should take a lead responsibility in urging the development of a small community data system based upon the small community profile methodology designed for this study.**

Recommendation No. 17.—**The Small Town Services program should concentrate its efforts on communities of 25,000 population or less.**

Reorganization of HUD Field Organization

In March, 1970, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development announced new organization plans for HUD field offices. By September of this year the department intends to reorganize the present Regional Offices, establish four new Regional Offices, and establish 23 Area Offices.

According to the memorandum of March 23, 1970, the new functions of the various organizational levels will be as follows:

1. The Central Office will make and interpret policy, establish priorities, promulgate standards, criteria, and procedures for all levels of field operation, and direct program administration.

2. Regional Offices will supervise, direct, evaluate and guide Area and Insuring Office operations. They will represent the Secretary in the regions with the Governors, on the Regional Councils, and with other Federal agencies, and will coordinate HUD activities regionwide. They will be responsible among other things for allocations of program funds among area and insuring offices, receiving such funds and guidance and direction from appropriate Assistant Secretaries.

Regional Offices will not perform duplicate reviews and processing of operations carried out in area offices, but will provide program and technical back-up and support as needed.

3. Area Offices and Insuring Offices will be responsible for operating and decision-making functions in the field. Delegations to take final actions will be decentralized to this level, without procedural qualifications or review requirements to vitiate such authority.[15]

It is, of course, premature to assess at this time what the significance and over-all results of the field reorganization will be once the plan is fully implemented. Undoubtedly, the plan represents a major shift in HUD policy and apparently a long overdue recognition that field personnel understand far better than most headquarter's staff the special problems state and local officials face, and moreover, that they are in a better position geographically to work out problems with their counterparts at the other two levels. It should be cautioned, however, that the establishment of new area-wide offices at the Federal level may diminish efforts aimed at providing a larger role for state governments unless special care is taken at the same time to foster the participation of states in the intergovernmental process. Several recommendations in this study focus on enhancing state activities in regard to small community development.

True reform requires that much of the administrative detail connected with Federal programs be left to state and local governments, without involvement of the Federal government at any level. While the massiveness and complexity of the administrative machinery that has developed over the years cannot realistically be alleviated overnight, HUD's new policies should be viewed as an important step toward this goal. A word of caution should be indicated however. Visits

[15] Memorandum for George Romney, Secretary, Housing and Urban Development, March 23, 1970.

to thirty-six small communities and a general analysis of administrative procedures and requirements required to be fulfilled in submitting requests for Federal program funding cannot emphasize too strongly what has become a truism in any discussion of Federal programs. Federal programs have too many layers of red tape that only further inhibit the effective workings of the delivery system. The individual community profiles submitted as a part of this study confirm time and time again that the major complaint voiced about Federal programs was the cumbersome administrative machinery connected with the programs themselves.

If, in short, the forthcoming reorganization results in the creation of a delivery system which can respond rapidly and effectively, major obstacles will have been overcome and one of the major end products will certainly be better and more meaningful relationships between the Federal government and the local community. However, if the realignment of the field structure only results in the transfer of employees from one level to another and in a continuation of many presently restrictive and unreasonsable administrative requirements and procedures, than the reorganization will have, in effect, accomplished nothing.

PROGRAM APPLICATION REVIEWS

During the course of this study, an area involved with the applying for Federal program funding has come to the forefront on numerous occasions. This has been in connection with the utilization by HUD field personnel of pre-application conferences.

Pre-Application Conferences

A number of communities have indicated that the lack of pre-application conferences with HUD field personnel has resulted in misunderstandings about policies and procedures which have caused further delays in application processing. The study teams saw evidence that the lack of such reviews resulted in the approval of housing and urban renewal programs that the majority of the community was not ready to undertake. A pre-application conference might possibly have resulted in a different outcome. Pre-application conferences are being utilized in some of the HUD regional offices at the present time. This study recommends that HUD field offices be specifically directed to conduct such reviews with communities prior to the submittal of formal applications, especially for major projects such as housing, urban renewal and water and sewer. The pre-application conferences should be held in the applicant community and not at the HUD field office.

***Recommendation No. 18.*—HUD field offices should be instructed to conduct pre-application conferences with communities especially for major projects such as housing, urban renewal and water and sewer prior to submittal of formal applications for funding. Conferences should be held in the applicant community and not at the HUD field office.**

State Assistance to Small Communities

In recent years, increasing emphasis has been placed on the role of state governments and how they can be more effective in meeting the problems and needs of local communities The following is a brief de-

scription of developments that have transpired in the last few years and their apparent effectiveness as far as small communities are concerned.

STATE OFFICES OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

The growth of state agencies with the primary function of providing assistance and service to local governments is a recent phenomenon. New York was the first state to establish an office for local government in 1959. As of December 1969, twenty-seven states had established community affairs offices, almost all of these in the last three to four years. A total of eight agencies are independent departments. The establishment of such agencies has been spurred by section 901 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 which authorizes Federal grants-in-aid to "assist states to make available information and data on urban needs and assistance programs and activities, and to provide technical assistance to small communities (less than 100,000 population) with respect to the solution of urban problems."

The functions of state agencies for local affairs vary greatly from state to state but can be grouped in eight categories: (1) advice and information; (2) research and publication; (3) planning and area development; (4) preparation of policy recommendations; (5) promotion of cooperation between local governments; (6) training programs; (7) coordination of state services and federal grants; and (8) control programs (largely financial). From a program standpoint, state offices of community affairs are generally responsible for the following programs: urban planning, urban renewal, poverty, housing, health, model cities, environmental control, manpower, law enforcement, highway safety, technical assistance and community development training.

STATE FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The kind and degree of state financial assistance to small communities varies widely. The following are examples of what some states are doing to assist communities.

New York demonstrates the broadening role being played by some states in the furnishing of both financial and technical assistance to small communities. In the last few years it has enacted major state programs for urban development and provided for large-scale private participation, revised substantially upward per-capita aid to cities, furnished state financial and technical assistance for Model Cities planning, passed legislation designed to further inter-municipal cooperation through state aid for feasibility studies, and extended county planning powers to review of municipal subdivision regulations that have inter-municipal impact. The state also implemented its $2.5 billion transportation bond issue of 1967, increased its involvement in environmental quality efforts, and set up a loan program for hospital and nursing home construction.[16]

---

[16] International City Management Association, "The Municipal Year Book," (Washington, D.C. 1969) p. 5.

In the field of housing, New York's housing assistance program includes loans to cities, towns and villages for the provision of low-rent housing and subsidies to cover the full amount of the annual interest payment, in addition to one percent of the project cost. The state also has a comprehesive grant program pertaining to the problems of sewage systems. The state pays 100 percent of planning costs for sewage systems for counties, municipalities, cities, towns and other governmental units, and one-third of the cost of operating and maintaining treatment works. In addition, the state furnishes cities with their share of the non-Federal matching costs for sewage treatment facilities construction.

Five other states—Connecticut, Washington, Pennsylvania, Texas and California—all have programs providing grants or loans to municipalities or other political subdivisions to aid in the planning and establishment of sewage systems. Several states now have, or have had in the past, grant-in-aid programs for the construction of hospital and medical facilities. In addition to direct grants, four states—Alabama, California, Georgia and North Carolina—offer state aid to localities to supplement the local contribution to Federal grant programs for hospital construction.[17]

As of December 1967, 20 states were providing waste treatment works funds, 38 some form of airport financial aid, four hospital construction, 10 urban planning, eight water and sewer facilities, and 10 urban mass transportation.[18]

States are providing technical assistance in a number of other areas. Both the states of California and New Jersey assist communities in preparation of workable programs. Missouri helps communities prepare comprehensive plans. In the state of Maine, if a consultant prepares an application which is approved, the state will pay $1,000 towards its implementation. Thirty-one states offer land-use services to localities while 28 have a zoning service that is used by local units of governments. Twenty-eight states perform water and sewer services while 26 aid localities with housing and health services.[19]

SPECIAL STATE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

In addition to the program described above, a number of states have rather special or unique programs applicable to small communities. Some of these programs were in existence in the communities visited during the field work portion of the study.

In the state of Connecticut, a community development action plan has been devised. Under the plan, communities are given an opportunity to assess their needs and make plans and schedules to meet municipal goals and responsibilities for the social, physical and economic well-being of residents. Up to 75 percent of the cost of the plan is paid for by the state. While completion of a plan is not required for application or contract for any of the programs, the municipality must be undertaking the plan, show satisfactory progress and complete the plan within a two-year period to continue to be eligible for assistance.

---

[17] Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, "Urban and Rural America," (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, April, 1968), pp. 95–96.
[18] *Ibid.* p. 97
[19] *Ibid.* p. 98.

In 1968, the state of Pennsylvania initiated its "Partnership City Program". The "Partner-City" idea changes the traditional framework of state-local relations from one of state control over a particular community to one of state partnership with that community. Four projects are currently in operation including the Allegheny County program which is the only multiple community Model Cities project in the Nation. Under the program, technical aid and personnel as well as financial aid are given to the designated communities. An effort is made to involve leaders of the community in a critical self-analysis of their city with the hope that they will learn how the latest techniques of community development can be applied to the problems of their area.

The New Jersey Department of Community Affairs has a unique state model cities program which helps local governments to develop ideas and prepare applications for Federal grants. The state has also been quite active in providing financial assistance for a variety of community programs and projects.

The Texas Division of State-Local Relations, created in January 1969, has recently established an office specifically designed to assist small communities. Small communities for purposes of this program have been defined as those of 12,000 population and under. Texas is apparently the only state that has established a separate organizational unit for small communities.

EXPANSION OF STATE ROLE IN ASSISTING SMALL COMMUNITIES

Although some states have made commendable efforts in helping to meet the problems and needs of small communities, there is no question but that a great deal more effort is needed. The Kaiser Committee in its report *A Decent Home* indicated that it was "surprised by the relatively low level of State activity" in the housing and urban development field.[20] The Presidential National Advisory Commission Report entitled *The People Left Behind* remarked that "the failure of the States to recognize and cope with urban problems has been frequently cited and this failure has been attributed with some justification to rural-dominated legislatures." [21] The Douglas Commission found that only four states have adopted state-aid programs of any size and that only 9 of the 27 states with offices of community affairs had program responsibilities for urban renewal.[22]

The small communities visited in this study generally have had a low frequency of contact with state offices of community affairs and have mixed feelings about involvement in local affairs. These feelings have generally been confirmed by a recent study completed by the International City Management Association entitled "Federal, State, Local Relationships." [23] The study indicates that only 21 percent of the cities reporting felt that the state was most helpful in dealing with their

[20] Presidential Committee on Urban Housing, "A Decent Home," (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, December, 1968), p. 35.
[21] President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, "The People Left Behind", (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, September, 1967), p. 151.
[22] National Commission on Urban Problems, "Building the American City," (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, December, 1968).
[23] International City Management Association, Urban Data Service, *Federal State, Local Relationships.* (Washington, D.C., December, 1969).

problems as opposed to 38 percent for the Federal government. However 27 percent felt that neither the Federal government nor the states were helpful. Cities under 50,000 population found state governments more helpful than did the larger jurisdictions. In only 7 out of 24 states for which information was available did over half of the cities indicate that the state government was a significant help. A further indication of the feelings of state governments by the cities is the fact that the state is seldom the first contacted when the city needs information concerning application for grant-in-aid funds. The study also reveals that state offices of local affairs have made little impact at the local level. Only 15 percent of the cities reporting mentioned the state office of community affairs as a significant contribution to local problem solving. Over 25 percent of the cities in the 10,000–50,000 population category indicated that they contacted the state less than once a year. The over-all percent of local government contacts by the state was not much higher.

It would of course be unfair to indicate that the states have not made substantial progress in the last decade in attempting to regain their earlier key position in the American Federal system. The cited examples of what some states are doing to assist local governments in solving problems and needs are testimony to this fact. Although larger municipalities continue to doubt whether the states can respond effectively to their needs, the Federal government has demonstrated a growing determination to strengthen the role of the states in the Federal system.

This study has been concerned with how the states can be more effective in assisting small communities. It was recommended earlier that the Federal government make more funds available to the states under the Community Development Training and Urban Information and Technical Assistance programs. Furthermore, it has been recommended that states assume administration of the new codes improvement program as they have done for the comprehensive planning assistance program. In addition, the following recommendations are also made:

Recommendation No. 19.—The Federal Government should encourage the establishment of offices of Community Affairs in states which do not have them.

Recommendation No. 20.—The Federal Government should encourage states to assume greater financial responsibilities for assisting small communities in such areas as technical and planning assistance, housing, urban renewal and other programs aimed at rebuilding and revitalizing small communities.

STATE ENCOURAGEMENT OF SMALL COMMUNITY CONSOLIDATION

While this study has not been specifically concerned with the proliferation of municipal governments, it is appropriate here to indicate and re-emphasize the need for greater state involvement in both the discouragement of new, non-viable local governments and the encouragement of municipal consolidations and/or transfer of area-wide functions to regional agencies. A number of states have recently moved toward the establishment of more stringent regulations for municipal

incorporations. These include California, Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Virginia and Washington.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has recommended another method for halting the continued increase of non-viable municipalities and also the encouragement of boundary adjustments. The Commission has specifically proposed that states should empower a State agency or a local agency formation commission to "order the dissolution or consolidation of local units of government within metropolitan areas." As a minimum boundary commissions would assure that proposals for new municipalities and special districts or for municipal annexations are analyzed carefully from the standpoint of their long-range and intergovernmental effects. "The State or local regulatory agency," the Commission observed, "should examine closely those units of local government that appear to be least viable under the terms of the statute (and) . . . be empowered to mandate the dissolution or otherwise." The Commission has likewise suggested that state grants-in-aid be used to achieve this purpose. The proposal is similar to that utilized in bringing about school district consolidations in many areas of the country. Under the program, school district consolidation has been achieved in many States by fashioning school aid formulas that reward districts that reorganize and penalize small inefficient ones that do not. The Commission recommended in its 1965 report that each State "examine its present system of grants, shared taxes, and authorization for local nonproperty taxes, and remove all features that aggravate differences in local fiscal capacity to deal with service requirements in metropolitan areas and that encourage or support the proliferation of local governments within such areas." [24]

In its study of the fiscal system completed in 1967, the Commission expressed the view that State aid formulas should provide positive disincentives to the creation or continuation of small units of local government in metropolitan areas. The Commission specifically urged "amendment of formulas providing State aid to local governments so as to eliminate or reduce aid allotments to small units of local government not meeting statutory standards of economic, geographic, and political viability." [25]

Various other studies in recent years have proposed methods by which the continued proliferation of municipal governments can be stopped or corrected in some fashion. The Council of Economic Development in a recent report proposed a two-tier level of government, with area-wide functions being assumed by a regional level of government.

An analysis of many small communities can only lead to the conclusion that both the need for discouraging further proliferation of governmental units and greater effort toward the consolidation of municipal governments should be pushed vigorously by state governments.

---

[24] Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, "Metropolitan Social and Economic Disparities: Implication for Intergovernmental Relations in Central Cities and Suburbs," (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, January, 1965), p. 123.

[25] Advisory Commission on International Relations, "Fiscal Balance in the American System," (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, October, 1967), Vol. 2, p. 14.

Recommendation No. 21.—**The Federal Government should urge states to strongly discourage the further proliferation of municipalities and provide financial and other incentives to encourage either municipal consolidations or the transfer of area-wide functions to regional agencies.**

The Growth of Regional Agencies

The proliferation and vast expansion of Federal assistance programs in the 1960's has in turn resulted in the rapid growth of regional or multi-county agencies throughout the country. Practically every major Federal agency has created a regional counterpart directed at coordinating specific areas of concern on the regional level. The Department of Commerce has established economic development districts; the Department of Labor has formed a cooperative area manpower planning system and a concentrated employment program; the Appalachian Regional Commission has organized local development districts; the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has established comprehensive area health planning agencies; and the Department of Agriculture has set up resource conservation and development projects, rural renewal projects, rural areas development committees, technical action panels and concerted services coordinators. In 1968, HUD was given authority to sponsor non-metropolitan districts in cooperation with the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce.

Several states designed coordinating mechanisms of their own. By 1969, more than half the states had plans in being, or were developing them, to group counties into substate regions for planning and development purposes. Local law enforcement planning districts were also being formed as a result of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act and Councils of Governments (COGS) had increased substantially.

This study has been primarily concerned with the role assumed by economic development districts, regional planning commissions, councils of government and non-metropolitan planning districts. A brief description of their functions and growth follows.

Economic Development Districts

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 authorized a new device—the economic development district, a multi-county entity usually embracing from five to ten counties. As defined in the 1965 act, an economic development district had to include two or more redevelopment areas and at least one "economic development center" (or "growth center"). The center itself need not be in a redevelopment area but must be so located that its growth would contribute to the revival of the adjacent depressed counties. The growth center was made eligible for the same assistance—grants and loans for public facilities and loans and guarantees for industrial or commercial development—as that offered the redevelopment area. To encourage the formation of districts, the act also increased by 10 percentage points the Federal share of the cost of public works projects in redevelopment areas located within districts. EDA was authorized

to make grants up to 75 percent of the administrative expenses of the district organization with the remainder being provided by the counties making up the district. By the end of 1969, over 100 economic development districts had been organized.

With the passage of the 1965 act and the establishment of EDA came a renewed emphasis on planning. The act extended requirements for an overall economic development program (OEDP) to the new districts as well as the established redevelopment areas and specifically enjoined the districts to include in their OEDP's "adequate land use and transportation planning" and "a specific program for district cooperation, self-help and public investment."

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 authorized the establishment of multi-county economic development bodies (designated as local development districts) in the Appalachian region. As of June 30, 1968, a total of twenty-eight local development districts had been recognized by the Appalachian Regional Commission and were receiving Federal funds. Five other Federal-state regional commissions have been established but have not embarked on programs for the creation of districts. The five commissions cover New England, the northern Great Lakes states, the Ozarks, the southern Coastal Plains, and the Four Corners region of Utah, Colorado, Arizona and New Mexico.

REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCIES

The Federal government's Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 has provoked unparalleled development in the field of regional planning. The requirement that certain applications for Federal aid (approximately 47 grant and loan programs) must be approved by an area-wide agency designated to perform metropolitan or regional planning has led to two different kinds of development.

The legislation has been a major factor in the emergence of councils of government (COGS). According to the 1969 Directory of Regional Councils published by the National Service to Regional Councils, there are 142 COGS in the United States.

In the second place, it has led to the rapid development by the states of regional planning agencies. By 1969, more than half the states had plans in being, or were developing them, to group their counties into substate regions for planning and development purposes.

NON-METROPOLITAN PLANNING DISTRICTS

The Housing Act of 1968 contained provisions for extending HUD's planning assistance program (authorized by section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954)—which already covered individual rural counties and multi-county metropolitan planning bodies—to cover non-metropolitan multi-county planning organizations as well. While funds under section 701 are disbursed by HUD, the bill provides a statutory role for the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of HUD is required

to consult with the Secretary of Agriculture prior to approving any planning grants for the new districts, and the Department of Agriculture is authorized to provide technical assistance both prior to and following the formal organization of districts. Economic development districts (as well as local development districts in Appalachia), are eligible for the HUD-administered planning grants, and the Secretary of HUD is directed to consult with the Secretary of Commerce before approving any grant to an ERA or to an non-metropolitan district in any area that overlaps that of an EDD. Commerce is also granted technical assistance authority corresponding to that of Agriculture.

The new non-metropolitan districts were given a broad function. The legislation was to cover planning for land use; public facilities; governmental services; human and natural resources development; long-range fiscal planning; programming of capital improvements; and "coordination of all related plans and activities of the State and local governments and agencies concerned." Over 40 non-metropolitan planning districts were funded on 1970.[26]

As indicated previously, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 provided for area-wide reviews of grant and loan programs in metropolitan areas. The Comprehensive Planning Assistance Guidebook indicates that "district planning agencies should also assume an important coordinative role in which they review projects proposed by local governments, special districts, and other agencies and comment on their relation to plans and programs for the district." [27]

Bureau of the Budget Circular A–95 grants non-metropolitan planning districts the same formal areawide review powers as in metropolitan areas. Although the problems are obviously not as complex as those in urban centers, the importance of proper planning and development is no less important.

A study has not made a financial analysis of the funds available in each non-metropolitan planning district to carry out its duties and responsibilities. A visit was made however to one such agency during the course of the field work for this study. For the current fiscal year, the Commission is operating on a total budget of $30,000, $20,000 of which is from the Federal government. Such a budget is inadequate to carry out the responsibilities envisioned by the creation of such districts. Like with so many other programs, the necessary financial assistance for the effective operation of the program has not been made available.

COORDINATION OF REGIONAL AGENCIES

The emergence of regional agencies has brought with it the problem of overlapping and often conflicting areawide boundaries. This in turn has resulted in the problems of duplication, conflicting policies and programs and in some cases a general uneconomical use of resources and facilities. This situation led the President to issue a memorandum

---

[26] The Brookings Institution, *Making Federation Work,* (Washington, D.C., 1969), pp. 152–66.

[27] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Comprehensive Planning Assistance (Handbook I) Guidelines Leading To A Grant,* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, March, 1969), Appendix 1–A, p. 24.

on September 2, 1966 addressed to Federal departments and agencies declaring that:

"State and local development planning agencies should be encouraged to work together in using common or consistent planning bases (i.e., statistical and economic estimates), and in sharing facilities and resources.

"Boundaries for planning and development districts assisted by the Federal government should be the same and should be consistent with established state planning districts and regions. Exceptions should be made only where there is clear justification."

Bureau of the Budget Circular A–80,[28] "Coordination of development planning for programs based on multi-jurisdictional areas," was issued to implement the President's memorandum. The circular recognized the primary role of the Governor in the development and designation of regions within the state and declared that:

"Prior to the designation (or approval) of the designation of any planning and development district or region, federal agency procedure will provide a period of thirty days for the Governor(s) of the State(s) in which the district or region will be located to planning and development districts or regions established by the State. Where the State has established such planning and development districts, the boundaries of the designated areas will conform to them unless there is clear justification for not doing so. Where the State has not established planning and development districts or regions which provide a basis for evaluation of the boundaries of the area proposed for designation, major units of general local government in such area should also be consulted prior to designation of the area."

Other than the coordinating requirements set forth in the budget circulars, there is nothing to preclude the overlapping of the planning and development areas of different programs. The problem has been analyzed in detail in two recent studies. One study found that the one exception to overlapping multi-county organizations was in the State of Georgia. There, the state-authorized pattern of area planning and development commissions pre-dated the Federal sponsorship of multi-county districting, and the Federal districts conform to the area pattern. The commissions themselves act as the economic development districts and as the local development districts for the Applachian Regional Commission.

In other states, however, where state regional patterns were adopted only after Federally sponsored districts were established, adjustment of district boundaries to conform to the state pattern has been slow in coming—despite the Budget Bureau's instructions.[29]

Another study found examples of the overlapping of the planning areas of different programs. The study further indicated that "there is a question whether a stronger mechanism than A–80 might be employed to realize the intent of that circular and the President's Memo of 2 September 1966 which it implements." The study went on to pro-

---

[28] Budget Bureau Circular A–80 has been superseded by A–95 but the language is still essentially the same.

[29] The Brookings Institution, *Making Federalism Work*, (Washington, D.C., 1969), p. 205.

pose that "a single system of planning districts for physical and economic development be established in a state as a requirement for receiving assistance under these programs." Under the proposal, "The system of districts could serve for all physical and economic development planning in the state."[30]

Only one agency would be established in each district to handle physical and economic development. This proposal has attractive advantages and will probably in the long run be the most effective solution to the problem. However there is little past experience to indicate that it will be adopted without considerable initiative on the part of the state governments and active support by the Federal government. The provisions of Budget Bureau Circular A–95, if implemented by the states as required, would certainly improve the present situation considerably. It is suggested that the Budget Bureau, with the active support of the President, actively encourage state governments to conform to provisions of the administrative regulations. If this is not forthcoming within a reasonable period of time, other means should be considered to produce compliance.

Recommendation No. 22.—HUD should recommend to the Bureau of the Budget that it should actively encourage state governments to implement provisions of the Budget Bureau directives providing for common or consistent planning and development districts at the regional level. If conformance is not forthcoming within a reasonable amount of time, other means should be considered to produce compliance.

The establishment of common or consistent geographical district boundaries for regional agencies will of course not in itself lead to better program coordination between the various governmental units themselves. In order to provide for better coordination and the common use of resources where feasible (funds, personnel, facilities and services, statistics, etc.) among related programs within the district areas, the states should designate one of the regional agencies to take the lead in such efforts. The non-metropolitan planning district or COG in the area may be the most appropriate agency to assume this function. Here again, however, ultimate responsibility for coordination should remain with the state governments.

Recommendation No. 23.—HUD should urge the states to delegate responsibility for providing better coordination and the common use of resources where feasible in each regional planning and development district to one of the local participating agencies. The nonmetropolitan planning district or COG should be considered for assumption of this role. Ultimate responsibility for coordination however should remain with the states.

[30] Auerbach Corporation, *Federal Grant Program Planning Requirements Coordination Study (Phase II)*, (Philadelphia: 1968), p. 7–4.

APPENDIX A

Small Community Profile

COMMUNITY DATA SECTION

I GOVERNMENT

A. Form of Government

1) Council - Manager ◯
   Mayor - Council ◯
   Commission ◯
   Town Meeting ◯
   Other ◯

2) Year Adopted _____

3) Selection of Mayor:
   (a) Directly Elected ◯
   (b) Chosen from Council Membership ◯
   (c) Other method ◯

4) Mayor Member of City Council: Yes ◯ No ◯

5) Mayor's Office:
   (a) Term: _____yrs.
   (b) Full-time position: Yes ◯ No ◯
   (c) Rate of Pay $_____

6) Total Number of Councilmen: _____ (Excluding Mayor)

7) Council Term of Office: _____

8) Overlapping Terms: Yes ◯ No. ◯

9) Elected: At large ◯ By wards ◯

10) Other Elected City Officials and Terms of Office:

Official	Term of Office

70-132 O-71—8

11) Special Districts in Community (including School District):

Special District	Elected or Appointed Board	Appointed By

D. Financial Characteristics

1) Total Assessed Valuation of Real Property

	Current Year	Assessment Ratio*	Five Years Ago	Assessment Ratio*
Residential :	$_____	_____	$_____	_____
Commercial :	_____	_____	_____	_____
Industrial :	_____	_____	_____	_____
Total	$_____		$_____	
City Government	$_____	_____	$_____	_____
School District	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other Special Districts	_____	_____	_____	_____
Total	$_____		$_____	_____

2) Total Tax Rate

	Current Year	Five Years Ago
City Government	$_____	$_____
School District	_____	_____
Other Special Districts	_____	_____
Total	$_____	$_____

* Per cent of market value.

3) Government Finances

		Current Fiscal Year	Five Years Ago
(a)	Revenues*		
(i)	Total	$_____	$_____
(ii)	% from Property Taxes	_____	_____
(iii)	% from intergovernmental sources		
	(a) state	_____	_____
	(b) federal	_____	_____
(iv)	% misc. revenues	_____	_____
(v)	Education Only	_____	_____
(b)	Expenditures*		
(i)	Total	$_____	$_____
(ii)	Operating Budget	_____	_____
(iii)	Capital Improvement Budget	_____	_____
(iv)	Current Expenditure on Debt Service	_____	_____
(v)	Education Only	_____	_____
(c)	Utilities		
(i)	Revenues	$_____	$_____
(ii)	Expenditures	_____	_____
(d)	Revenue Bonds	$_____	$_____
(e)	General Obligation Bonds	$_____	$_____
(f)	Municipal Bond Rating:	_____	

* Excluding utility revenues and expenditures

E. Personnel Administration

	Current Fiscal Year	Five Years Ago
1) Total City Personnel (full time) (Exclusive of education)	_____	_____
2) % Non White	_____	_____
3) Total Police Personnel	_____	_____
4) Total Fire Personnel (full time)	_____	_____
5) Total Fire Volunteer Personnel	_____	_____

F. Planning

1) City Planning Commission: Yes ◯ No ◯

2) Year Planning Commission Established _____

3) Full time City Planner: Yes ◯ No ◯

4) Part-time City Planner: Yes ◯ No ◯

5) Planning Consultant: Yes ◯ No ◯

6) Comprehensive Plan: Yes ◯ No ◯

7) Zoning Ordinance: Yes ◯ No ◯

8) Subdivision Regulations: Yes ◯ No ◯

9) Annexations (since 1960)

Number _____

Square Miles _____

Population of Annexed Area _____

H. City Appearance

1) Architectural Review Board: Yes ◯ No ◯

2) Sign Ordinance Yes ◯ No ◯

3) Ordinances Regulating Dumping, etc. Yes ◯ No ◯

I. Government Services — Provided By

1) Type - Service	City Govt.	County Govt.	State Govt.	Special District*	Shared With Other Govt. Agency	Private**
Administrative						
Assessing	___	___	___	___	___	___
Tax Collection	___	___	___	___	___	___
Planning	___	___	___	___	___	___
Public Safety						
Police	___	___	___	___	___	___
Fire	___	___	___	___	___	___
Building and Zoning Enforcement	___	___	___	___	___	___
Civil Defense	___	___	___	___	___	___
Animal Control	___	___	___	___	___	___
Public Works						
Engineering	___	___	___	___	___	___
Streets & Traffic	___	___	___	___	___	___
Storm Sewers	___	___	___	___	___	___
Sanitary Sewers	___	___	___	___	___	___
Sewage Treatment	___	___	___	___	___	___
Drainage and Flood Control	___	___	___	___	___	___
Refuse Collection and Disposal	___	___	___	___	___	___

* Including school district.

** Where service is furnished by a non-governmental agency, indicate whether city has contract or agreement covering all or part of the specific service and city cost, if any.

Type - Service	City Govt.	County Govt.	State Govt.	Special District*	Shared With Other Govt. Agency	Private**
Water	____	____	____	____	____	____
Electricity	____	____	____	____	____	____
Gas	____	____	____	____	____	____
Recreation and Parks	____	____	____	____	____	____
Recreation Programs	____	____	____	____	____	____
Parks and Playgrounds	____	____	____	____	____	____
Libraries						
Library Facilities	____	____	____	____	____	____
Health						
Hospitals	____	____	____	____	____	____
Public Health or Clinic Facilities	____	____	____	____	____	____
Comprehensive Health Centers	____	____	____	____	____	____
Mental Health Centers	____	____	____	____	____	____
Welfare						
Categorical Grants	____	____	____	____	____	____
General Relief	____	____	____	____	____	____
Transportation						
Bus Facilities	____	____	____	____	____	____
Airport Facilities	____	____	____	____	____	____

* Including school district.

** Where service is furnished by a non-governmental agency, indicate whether city has contract or agreement covering all or part of the specific service and city cost, if any.

2) Fire Insurance Rating

City _____

Fire Dept. _____

J. Federal Programs

Federal Programs Used in Community

Administering Agency	Program	Year	Amount of Federal Grant	Housing Units

II. ECONOMIC

A. Population

1) Population Statistics

	Latest	% Inc. over 1960	1960	% Inc. over 1950	1950
(a) City					
(b) County					

2) Population Composition

(a) Age Grouping	1960	1950	% Change
% under 18			
% 65 and over			
Median age			
% male population (14 & over)			

(b) Racial	1960	1950	% Change
Total			
White			
Negro			
Other non-white			

(c) Foreign born population _____%

(d) Native white of foreign extraction _____%

(e) Principal nationalities _____

(f) Population per household _____

(g) Population per square mile _____

B. Geographic Location and Area

1) SMSA: Yes ◯ No ◯

2) Total square miles (incorp. area) _____

3) Economic Development Region

(a) Appalachian ◯ (b) Coastal Plains ◯

(c) New England ◯ (d) Ozark ◯

(e) Four Corners ◯ (f) Upper Great Lakes ◯

(g) Economic Development District ◯

4) Nearest Community over 50,000 _____ Distance _____

5) Contiguous municipalities (name and population) _____

_____

C. Labor Force

1) Total Employment by Industry Classification — No. Employed

Agriculture Services, Forestry and Fisheries

Mining

Contract Construction

Manufacturing

Transportation, Utilities and Sanitary Services

Wholesale Trade

Retail Trade

Finance, Insurance and Real Estate

Services

2) Labor force as % of total population _____%

3) Women in labor force _____%

4) Labor force unemployed _____%

5) Manufacturing _____%

6) White Collar _____%

7) Working outside county of residence _____%

8) National Unions in Community: _____

_____

D. Income

1) Median family income $_____

2) Families with incomes under $3000 _____%

E. Industry

(List principal industries and number of employees)

Industry	No. of Employees

F. Financial Institutions

	Total Number	Within City	Within Unincorporated Areas of County
1) Banks:			
Total Assets or Deposits			
2) Savings and Loan Associations			
Total Assets or Deposits			

G. Transportation

1) Inter-city Facilities

(a) Passenger — Bus ◯ Air ◯ Rail ◯

(b) Freight — Truck ◯ Air ◯ Rail ◯

2) Intra-city Facilities

(a) Passenger — Bus ◯ Cab ◯

III. PHYSICAL

A. Housing

1) Housing Statistics

(a) Sound Housing _____%

(b) Built in 1939 or earlier _____%

(c) No. of new residential building permits in last 5 years _____

Dollar value $_____

(d) 1.01 or more persons per room _____%

(e) Owner-occupied _____%

(f) Home-owner vacancy rate _____%

(g) Rental vacancy rate _____%

(h) Dwellings served by public sewer facilities _____%

(i) Dwellings served by public or private water system _____%

(j) Median value $_____

2) Local Housing Authority: Yes ◯ No. ◯

3) Year Housing Authority Established _____

4) Type of Public Housing

(a) Family ◯ No. of Units _____

(b) Elderly ◯ No. of Units _____

5) Type of subsidized housing

(a) Family ◯ No. of Units _____

(b) Elderly ◯ No. of Units _____

6) Housing Code: Yes ◯ No ◯

if Yes City Code State Code

7) Local Real Estate Board: Yes ◯ No ◯

B. Urban Renewal

1) Local Redevelopment Authority: Yes ◯ No ◯

2) Year Redevelopment Authority Established _____

D. Land Use

1) Land use by category and % breakdown

IV. SOCIAL

A. Public Health Services and Facilities

1) Health Code: Yes ◯ No ◯

If yes, City Code ◯ State Code ◯

2) Administered by: City Gov't ◯ County Gov't ◯ State Gov't ◯

B. Medical Care Services and Facilities

1) Hospitals in city (No.) _____

2) Hospital Beds per 1,000 population _____

3) Infant Mortality (deaths under one year per 1,000 population) _____

4) Doctors per 1,000 population _____

5) Dentists per 1,000 population _____

C. Public Welfare Services

1) Services Provided:

Public Assistance Yes ◯ No ◯

Child Welfare Yes ◯ No ◯

General Assistance Yes ◯ No ◯

Others (List _____

2) Administered by: City Gov't ◯ County Gov't ◯ State Gov't ◯

3) Number of individuals receiving public aid:

(a) Present _____

(b) Five years ago _____

D. Educational Programs and Facilities

1) No. of public elementary schools _____ Enrollment _____

2) No. of public high schools _____ Enrollment _____

3) No. of parachial elementary schools _____ Enrollment _____

4) No. of parachial high schools _____ Enrollment _____

5) No. of private elementary schools _____ Enrollment _____

6) No. of private high schools _____ Enrollment _____

7) Vocational training school: Yes ◯ No ◯

(a) Courses provided: _____

8) Number of Colleges in community

	State Supported	Private
(a) Junior		
(b) Four year colleges		

9) Median years school completed by adult residents 25 years and over ____

10) High school graduates entering college as % of total _____%

COMMUNITY ANALYSIS SECTION

I. GOVERNMENT

A. Form of Government

1) Has the form of city government been changed recently? If so, why? If not, has there been any unsuccessful efforts to do so in the past?
1 16*

2) Do you believe a different form of government would be more beneficial to the city?
1 12 13 14 16

3) Does the city have its own home rule charter or does it operate under state statute provisions?
1

4) Is there state enabling legislation for home rule applicable to cities of this size?
1

B. Political Organization

1) What groups are usually represented on the City Council (i.e., nationality or ethnic groups, religious groups, business and labor, geographical groupings)?
1 12 13 14 16

2) What party faction or group currently has majority control of the city council?
1 12 13 14 16

3) Was there any opposition ticket or individual opposition to incumbents in the last election? What percent of the vote did they poll?
1 12 13 14 16

*These numbers correspond to the community positions to which the question was addressed. See Table II-1, p. 31.

4) If there was a recent change in the administration, what were the issues or events that prompted the change?
1 12 13 14 16

5) Has there been a history of community disagreement and rapid political turnover (including city managers) in the city?
1 12 13 14 15 16

6) How many appointments does the mayor and/or the council make to non-administrative positions (boards and commissions)?
1 13 14 16

a) Do the same people tend to be reappointed?

b) Has the city experienced any difficulty in getting residents to serve on boards and commissions?

7) Are there any minority group members on either the city council or city boards and commissions?
1

C. Intergovernmental Relations

1) What contractual arrangements or agreements presently exist between the city and other governmental units (e.g. other cities, special districts, counties, regions, multi-county planning districts, state)?
1 2 6 7 15 16

2) Do legal constraints prohibit the sharing of services among governmental units?
1 2 6 7 15 16

3) Are there significant intergovernmental conflicts between the city and other governmental agencies?
1 2 6 7 15 16

70-132 O-71—9

4) In what instances are governmental functions shared by more than one agency? Do the relationships function smoothly?
1 2 6 7 16

5) Do any other governmental agencies have offices located in the city?
1 2 6 7

6) Does the city contribute financial or membership support to county or regional functions?
1 2 6 7

D. Financial Characteristics

1) What accounts for the principal changes in the distribution of major expenditures over the last five-year period.
1 16

2) If you have received state and/or federal program funds, how has the local share been financed?
1 2 6

3) What effect, if any, have federal programs had on:
1 2 6 16
a) operating and capital budgets

b) user assessments and charges

4) Has the procurement of matching funds for Federal and/or State programs had a substantial impact on the municipal budget?
1 16

5) To what extent does money received from outside sources affect local budgetary decisions?
1 15 16

6) What financial impact on the total community and individual residents do you project in the future for federal or state programs which are proposed or underway?
1 2 16

7) What state (or local) financial limitations are the various governmental units in your community subject to (e.g. maximum tax rates, maximum debt limits)?
1 15

8) How close is the present tax rate and debt level to the maximum limit?
1 15

9) Can the maximum rates be increased by referendum? Have any referendum proposals been adopted or defeated in the last ten years?
1 15

10) Is there a requirement for a balanced budget for the local general government, education district, or other special districts?
1 15

11) Was there a surplus or deficit at the end of the last budget year?
1 15

12) What has been the trend over the past five years in local tax rates and assessments?
1 15

13) Does the city have a long range capital improvement program? If so, is it up-dated every year?
1 2 6

14) What capital improvements have been made by the local government in the last five years? (Public buildings, public works, parks, recreation, public safety, etc.) What was the cost and how was each financed?
1 2 3

15) Has there been a property tax equalization study carried out recently? What was the result?
1

16) Has there been major resistance by citizens to increased taxes?
1 14 15 16

17) Have the officials who increased taxes usually been defeated at the next election?
1 14 15 16

18) Have residents of the city voted on any bond issues in the past ten years? What were they for? Which ones were defeated by the voters?
1 14 15 16

19) Have special districts or authorities been established to overcome general debt limitations?
1

E. Personnel Administration

1) Does your city have a civil service or merit system? If so, does it cover all employees?
1

2) What entrance qualifications are usually required for city manager, city engineer, city planner, and other key personnel?
1 16

3) Who has the authority to hire city personnel?
1

4) Are there any problems in recruiting personnel? If so, what steps have been taken to alleviate this problem?
1 16

5) Does the city have an active in-service training program? What employees or departments are included?
1

6) Are any city employees unionized? What unions are represented?
1

7) What is the rate of turnover among city personnel?
1

F. Planning

1) Does the city have a planning commission or is planning provided by another governmental unit such as the county?
2 6

2) How many members are on the city planning commission? What occupational groups do they represent? Do any of them hold other elective or appointive positions?
2 12 13 14

3) Does the comprehensive plan include the following basic elements:

a) Land use and zoning

b) Transportation

c) Recreation

d) Housing

e) Utilities

f) Public Facilities

List any others:
2 4 5 6 15

4) Are legislative actions consistent with the plan? Is there a conscious effort to implement plans? Have priorities been established?
1 2 6 12 16

5) Was the city's comprehensive plan financed with 701 funds?
2 6

6) If yes, was the study performed by a private consultant, county or state government agency or other organization or individual?
2 6

7) What initiated your interest in 701 planning?
2 6

8) Have neighboring cities had 701 grants? Were their plans coordinated with yours?
1 2 6

9) Have you had any federal grants which required a comprehensive plan as a prerequisite? Which ones? Did they cover all areas of the plan or only the subject of the project?
2

10) Have you updated your comprehensive plan recently?
2 4 5 6

11) Does your city have a certified workable program?
2 4 5 6

12) If yes, has it been recertified?
2 4 5

13) If not, does it have codes (e.g. housing, building, electrical, plumbing, fire prevention)?
2 4 5

14) For what Federal program(s) did you develop a workable program? Was it a sensible requirement?
2 4 5

15) Does 701 planning and workable programs satisfy your city's planning requirements?
2 4 5

16) What provisions are there for regional planning in your area?
2 4 5 6 15

a) If in SMSA, is there a metropolitan planning agency?

b) If not in SMSA, is there a non-metropolitan planning agency?

c) Is the county or regional planning agency involved in planning within your city?

d) Is coordination a problem?

e) What are the financial and manpower capabilities of the planning groups?

f) How do you participate in the regional agency?

17) Have you in applying for federal programs submitted your plans and programs to these agencies?
1 2 6

18) What are the major legal constraints to either annexation or consolidation under state statues?
2 4 5

19) If your city annexed any land since 1960, give the reasons and long run implications?
1 2

20) Have you been able to provide the services to the annexed area at the same level as provided to the rest of the city?
1 2

21) Are you planning on any additional annexations or consolidations?
1 2

22) Are there adjacent urban areas on the fringe of your city which are not incorporated? If so, has this created problems? Has the city sought to annex these areas?
1 2

23) Did you undertake a community renewal program (CRP)?
1 2 4 5

24) If yes, why was it developed?
1 2 4 5

25) Have you followed it with an urban renewal program?
1 2 4

G. Technical Assistance

1) Has the state government, state municipal league, state university, or other institution provided technical assistance to the city under the Urban Information and Technical Assistance program (Title IX)? If so, in what form? What is your evaluation?
1 2 4 5 6

2) Has the local government participated in a state training program under the Community Development Training program (Title VIII)? If so, what was your evaluation of the programs?
1 2 4 5 6

I. Governmental Services

1) Are your police and fire services and facilities adequate?
1 12 13 14 16

2) What steps have you taken to improve your fire rating?
1 12 13 14 16

3) What are your major law enforcement problems (e.g. juvenile delinquency, narcotics, burglaries)? What steps have you taken to correct them?
1 12 13 14 16

4) Are there any particular problems with the courts and probation departments?
1 12 13 14 16

5) Has the city applied for any planning or implementation funds under either the Comprehensive Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 or the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1968?
1

6) Do you have responsibility for all street construction and maintenance within the corporate limits of your city?
3

7) Do you have a planned and scheduled street construction and maintenance program?
3

8) Do you have a formal program to upgrade street lighting?
3

9) How frequently is the garbage collected? How is it disposed of? Is there a fee?
3

10) Is there a local ordinance regulating private disposal of garbage and trash? If so, how is it enforced?
3

11) Are sufficient refuse disposal sites presently available? Will additional sites be necessary within the next five to ten years?
3 16

12) What public recreation facilities are available and who operates them?
1 2 12 16

13) Are they adequate to serve the present population?
1 2 12 16

14) Are public transportation facilities available to reach recreational facilities?
1 2 12 16

15) Is there a need for additional recreational facilities?
1 2 12 16

16) Are there groups in your city that are not served by your recreational program and facilities? If so, what groups are they, and why are they not served?
1 2 12 16

17) Are school facilities available for recreation during the summer and after school hours?
1 2 12 15 16

18) Is there a community center building? If so, what is it used for?
1 2 12 16

19) What private recreational facilities are available in the city?
1 2 12 16

J. Federal Programs

1) If you have not used Federal Programs, why not?
1 2 6 7 14 16

2) Did federal or state field representatives assist you by providing information and aid in preparing program applications?
1 2 4 5 6 7

3) Did you utilize the services of a private consultant in preparing program applications?
1 2 4 5 6 7

4) Do you feel additional outside assistance from the state or federal regional offices should be available to cities for this purpose?
1 2 4 5 6 7

5) What referenda or special requirements are necessary before you can accept Federal programs (i.e. public referendum)?
1 2 4 5 6 7 16

6) Have any Federally funded programs been disapproved locally? Why?
1 2 4 5 7 16

7) Have any of your Federal program requests been disapproved by the Federal government? Why?
1 2 4 5 6 7

8) Are you generally satisfied with the administrative procedures you followed in applying for federal grants and loans?
1 2 4 5 6 7 14 16

9) Are you generally satisfied with the results of the projects you have undertaken with federal funds?
1 2 4 5 6 7 14 16

10) Are there community needs or problems for which no Federal assistance is available? Do you think it should be?
1 2 6 7

K. Model Cities Program

1) Did you city consider applying for the model cities program? Why or why not?
1 2 4 5 7 8 16

2) If your city did apply, which individuals or organizations provided the initiative and guidance?
1 2 4 5 7 8 16

3) If your application was rejected, why do you think it was rejected?
1 2 4 5 7 8 16

4) Did you use a consultant in preparing your application? Did you receive any other outside assistance?
1 2 4 5 7 8

5) Is the CDA (city demonstration agency) well integrated with other units of government? Does it function adequately?
1 2 4 5 7 8 16

6) Who are the principal groups represented on the CDA through citizen participation?
1 2 4 5 7 8 16

II. ECONOMIC

A. Population

1) Do young people stay in the city to live and work?
1 2 6 12 13 14 15 16

2) If there has been a dominant pattern of migration, what have been its principal causes? Do you expect it to continue?
1 2 6 12 13 14 15 16

3) Are there any geographical concentrations of (1) old people, (2) poor people, (3) minority groups? Where are they located?
1 2 6 12 13 14 15 16

C. Labor Force

1) Has there been a change in the employment picture since 1960?
12 13 16

2) Is a lack of skilled labor a barrier to industrial development in your community?
2 6 12 13 16

3) In regard to employment do the resident firms complain about labor turnover and absenteeism?
12 13

4) Do local people get first consideration in job opportunities?
12 13 16

5) Are labor unions a powerful pressure group in the city?
12 13 16

D. Industry

1) Do one to three firms account for the majority of the total value of goods and services produced or sold and people employed?
1 12 13 14

2) If so, when were these firms established?
1 12 13 14

3) Have any new firms located in the city or has there been significant expansion of existing facilities in the last five years?
1 12 13 14 16

4) What do you think of the business prospects in relation to the future of the community?
1 2 6 12 13 14 16

5) What is the general attitude of the community toward the establishment of new industries?
1 2 6 12 13 14 16

6) What is the attitude of existing industry towards the promotion and location of new industry in the community?
1 2 6 12 13 14 16

E. Wholesale and Retail Trade

1) What is the pattern and distribution of wholesale and retail trade?
1 12 13 14

2) Have any stores been closing due to lack of business? Have they moved out of the CBD?
1 2 6 12 13 14 16

3) Are there new shopping centers? Why were they built? How are they performing relative to original expectations?
1 2 6 12 13 14 16

F. Financial Institutions

1) Are there sufficient financial institutions in the community to provide funds for financing plant construction, and other normal requirements of the community?
12 13 14 16

2) Does the array of these institutions meet the needs of all major segments of the community?
12 13 14 16

3) Are these institutions willing to accept a "normal" degree of risk in providing venture capital? (i.e., does the financial community have confidence in the future of the town?)
13 14

4) Is financing available for regular mortgage housing in your community?
14

5) Is capital available to provide the principal for subsidized housing?
14

6) Are banks willing to fund the above? If not, are they of assistance in providing outside sources?
14

7) What is the pattern of growth of time and demand deposits within the banking system of the community?
14

8) What % of local residents have time or demand deposits in the community?
14

G. Transportation

1) Are the transportation facilities available to the community adequate?
1 2 6 12 13 16

2) If not, what additional transportation facilities are needed?
1 2 6 12 13 16

3) Is either the movement of street traffic or parking a problem in the community? If so, what steps are being taken to alleviate the problem?
1 2 6 12 13 16

H. Business Organizations

1) Is there a Chamber of Commerce or other businessman's organization?
1 12 13 14 16

2) Is it involved in community development and improvement affairs?
1 12 13 14 16

I. Industrial Development Activities

1) Does your community have, or participate in an industrial development activity? If so, in what way?
1 2 6 12 13 14 16

2) What are the goals?
1 2 6 12 13 14 16

3) How this activity being implemented?
1 6 12 13 14

4) Has the community supported this effort by
1 6 12 13 14
tax abatements,

cost considerations,

additional provisions for community services?

5) What have been the principal results of these efforts, if any?
1 6 12 13 14 16

6) Has any programs been initiated within the community to examine the feasibility of selling or converting existing empty commercial or factory space for new users and obtaining new tenants? Are the programs publically sponsored? Are they privately financed?
1 6 12 13 14 16

7) Has the state or other governmental units assisted in these efforts?
1 6 12 13 14

70-132 O-71—10

III. PHYSICAL

A. Housing

1) Does your city have a program for eliminating substandard housing and meeting the requirements for additional housing for low and moderate income residents?

   (a) If yes, is the program intended for low income or moderate income or both?

   (b) What problems were encountered or developed in applying for and carrying out the project?
   1 2 5 12 14 16

2) Does your housing program satisfy the needs of minority residents in your community?
   1 2 5 14 16

3) What impact has low cost public housing had on the surrounding neighborhood? Has it caused any migration of families out of the neighborhood where the housing was built?
   1 2 5 12 13 14 16

4) Are you meeting the needs for low income rental housing in your community. family as well as elderly?
   1 2 5 12 13 14 16

5) What studies have been done on assessing this need recently?
   2 5

6) What new units are you planning on building? Will the new units be on scattered sites?
   2 5

7) If your city has public housing, have the following alternative methods been used or considered - leased housing (see 23) or private development (turnkey)?
5

8) Why did you use these alternatives? What were the advantages?
5

9) What happens to those people now living in public low rent housing who exceed the income level? Do you feel income ceilings are too low?
5 13 14

10) Are plans for subsidized housing being considered in your community? Who is the sponsor?
1 2 5 12 13 14 16

11) What special local government contributions were made for subsidized housing (e.g. tax abatements, zoning changes, changes in the cost of land)?
1 2 5

12) Who are the members of your housing authority, (in terms of positions held in the community)?
1 5

13) Is there any overlap with other public bodies?
1 5

14) Is the Housing Authority executive director full time or part-time?
5

15) Have you considered sharing management with another nearby authority?
5

16) What is the relationship between the Housing Authority and other public agencies?

(a) Local government (sanitation, recreation, law enforcement, etc.)

(b) Education (general, vocational training for residents)

(c) Health and welfare services

(d) Others
1 5 7 15

17) What percent of your residential structures have code violations?
2 5

18) Have you considered either a code enforcement grant, an urban renewal rehabilitation project, or an F.H.A. rehabilitation loan project to rehabilitate these dwellings or assist in relocation?
1 2 5

19) Are all the units in the city's housing projects filled? Is there a waiting list? If so, what plans do you have for altering the solution?
5

20) What influence does the local Real Estate Board have on public and private housing patterns in the community?
1 2 5 12 14 16

21) Has the Farmer's Home Administration provided housing programs in your community?
1 2 5 10

22) Are there unincorporated areas adjacent to your city that have substandard housing? Have any federal programs included these areas?
1 2 5 6

23) Is there a self help program for housing in your community? How is it funded?
1 2 5 12 14

B. Urban Renewal

1) How would you describe the physical condition of your central business district and its fringe residential areas?
1 2 4 12 13 14 16

2) What is the condition of other residential areas?
1 2 4 13 14 16

3) Do you feel that urban renewal can be of assistance in achieving your long range goals?
1 2 4 12 13 14 16

4) Do you have or are there plans for an urban renewal project(s) in your city? Are they residential, commercial, or industrial?
1 2 4 12 13 14 16

5) Is the community at large aware of the project? If so, what is the general reaction?
1 2 4 12 14 16

6) What was the objective and purpose in carrying out the project?
1 2 4 13 14 16

7) What was the local share composed of cash or an in kind contribution?
2 4

8) Who contributed the local share?
2 4

9) Did the state contribute?
2 4

70-132 O-71—11

10) Do you feel your project meets the critical needs of providing low and moderate income housing and jobs?
2 4 14

11) Do you feel you had a successful result from the urban renewal project? Has the city as a whole accepted it?
1 2 4 12 13 14 16

12) Are there any urban renewal projects in the city where only the land has been cleared and no new structures erected?
1 2 4

13) Who are the members of your urban renewal authority, (in terms of positions held in the community)?
1 2 4

14) Do any members of the urban renewal authority serve on other public boards and commissions?
1 4

C. Utilities

1) What utilities does your city own and operate?
3

2) Have you used an advance for Public Works Planning Loan (702) to design or upgrade your utility system?
3

3) What is the source of your water system? How is it treated? Is there an adequate supply both now and for the forseeable future, for both residential and industrial use?
3 7

4) Have you had to ration the use of water for any extended period of time during recent years?
3 7

5) Is the purification distribution system adequate? Does it serve the entire city? Are there adjacent unincorporated areas which are not served?
3 7

6) Is there a sanitary sewer system? If so what percentage of the city's sewage is treated? Does it meet the federal water pollution control requirements?
3 7

7) What type of sewage treatment plant do you have? Does it serve the entire city? Are adjacent areas, including unincorporated areas, included?
3

8) Are soil conditions acceptable for the use of septic tanks in the areas not served by public sewers?
3 7

9) Have you applied for a water and sewer grant or a public facility loan to upgrade either system?
3

10) If so, was it a joint project with any adjacent communities?
3

11) Was this a multi-program or agency effort?
3

12) Which federal agencies were involved (e.g. HUD, Interior, Agriculture, EDA, OEO)?
3

13) Is there a separate system for storm drainage?
3

14) Is water pollution a problem? If so, what is being done about it?
3 7 16

15) Is there significant water pollution in area lakes, streams or waterways? What are the major sources of pollution?
3 7 16

16) What is the extent of air pollution in the community? Who are major pollutors? What is the status of air pollution control in the community?
3 7 16

17) Are there any areas in the community prone to experiencing natural disasters? If so, has any government assistance been provided to solve the problem?
1 3 7 16

D. City Buildings

1) What are the present physical conditions of city-owned buildings? Does the capital improvement program include funds for the renovation or new construction of facilities as needed?
7 12 16

IV. SOCIAL

A. Public Health Services and Facilities

1) Is there a public health agency with a full time, qualified staff?
1 7

2) Does it have a full-time public health physician in charge?
1 7

3) Is there adequate regulation inspection of public eating places, food preparation, public facilities, meat processing and milk supply establishments?
1 7

4) Are there a sufficient number of health clinics and facilities available for residents of the community?
7 16

5) Are home health services provided?
7

6) Is any comprehensive health planning being carried out at the state or regional level? If so, how is the community involved.
6 7

7) Has the community received grants for the construction of public health facilities?
7

B. Medical Care Services and Facilities

1) Are there provisions for:
7

(a) hospital inpatient services

(b) hospital outpatient services

(c) medical care services

2) If not, how far are the nearest hospital facilities?
7

3) Are the hospital facilities public or private?
7

4) Is there a comprehensive health center (O.E.O.)?
7

5) Does the city have specialized facilities in the areas of:

(a) chronic disease

(b) mental health centers

(c) homes for the indigent

(d) orphanages
7

6) Are there extended care and nursing home facilities in the city?
1 7 12

7) Are all of these facilities and the services provided adequate with respect to:

(a) quality

(b) quantity

(c) location
7

C. Public Welfare Services

1) What share of the funds for categorical public assistance and general public assistance are provided by:

(a) city government

(b) county government

(c) state government
1 7

2) Has there been a steady increase in the number of individuals receiving public assistance aid?
7

3) Has your city provided any special programs or facilities for poverty or minority groups such as a neighborhood service center?
1 7 16

4) Does your city have a CAP agency or is it part of a larger CAP agency?
1 7 11

5) What kinds of programs does the CAP agency administer?
7 11

D. Educational Programs and Facilities

1) What formal contracts or agreements are in effect between the school board and the city government?
1 15 16

2) How adequately does the school system meet the labor training requirements within the community?
12 13 15

3) Does the school district operate vocational training programs?
12 13 15

4) Do you have any adult education classes?
15

5) Are the Federal and State governments playing any role in these activities? What has been the private sector involvement?
15

6) Does the school district operate work study programs?
13 15

7) Are there any OJT programs being conducted by industry or others within the community?
12 13 15

8) How is the school system generally regarded in the community? What have been the major issues of controversy in recent years?
1 13 15 16

E. Cultural Facilities

1) Does the city have a library?
9

2) How large is its collection?
9

3) How many residents hold library cards?
9

4) How is the library financed?

(a) public

(b) private
9

5) What other cultural programs does the community support on a regular basis?

(a) Theater

(b) Concerts

(c) Art shows

(d) Other
9 12 15 16

F. Community Organizations and Participation

1) What are the principal active organizations in the community in each of the following categories: (1) business and professional; (2) labor; (3) churches; (4) veteran's organizations; (5) women's organizations; (6) lodges; (7) private clubs; (8) health and welfare; (9) educational; (10) cultural and recreational.
1 7 12 13 14 15 16

2) Which of the above have active civic or charitable programs involving the community? Which have raised funds or contributed to civic programs?
1 7 12 13 14 15 16

3) Which community organizations do key local governmental officials belong to?
1 14 15 16

4) Is there a YMCA or YWCA in the community? Do they have their own buildings?
7 16

5) Is there a community chest or other organized drive for funds for voluntary agencies? Did it meet its goal in each of the last five years?
7 16

6) What per cent of the eligible citizens registered to vote in the last municipal election? What per cent voted?
1 16

7) Is there a community council or other advisory citizens body at work on community problems?
1

GENERAL ISSUES

1) What is the general image of the city? In terms of overall "quality of life," is it a preferred place in which to live? What is nice about living here? How is it for raising a family? Are there adequate health and recreation facilities as well as public service amenities?

2) a) Do you think there is a general awareness of the problems and needs of your city? Do you have any thoughts as to what changes might be made in the city and its socio-economic structure?

   b) What do you consider to be the most important problems facing the community today? What order of priority do you assign to each? What problems are receiving the most attention? Why? If there are high priority problems which are not receiving adequate attention, what is the reason?

   c) What do you consider to be the major accomplishments in the community over the last five years? Which of these received the widest public support? Which created the greatest divergence of opinion?

3) What do you feel is the economic climate and the general business future of your community? Do its residents make a decent standard of living? Can they obtain the basic goods and services which they desire?

4) What do you feel about the general capacity of the city to plan for its future? Do you feel that current issues are truly representative of the attitudes and capabilities of your city? Are the short range programs consistent with the community's long range goals? Do you feel that the major economic and social interests in your city are fully participating in the planning for the future of your city?

5) What is your general feeling towards Federal and/or State assistance in meeting the needs of your city? Do you feel the Federal and/or State assistance programs are adequately oriented or focused on the real needs and problems of a city? If not, what direction do you feel they should take?

APPENDIX C

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Eleventh Annual Report. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1970.

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Urban American and the Federal System. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1969.

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1969.

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. ACIR State Legislative Program. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1968.

The American Assembly, Columbia University, The States and the Urban Crisis. Washington, D.C. 1969.

Auerbach Corporation. Federal Grant Program Requirements Coordination Study (Phase I and II). Philadelphia, 1968.

Booth, David A., Council-Manager Government in Small Cities. Washington, D.C., International City Managers' Association, 1968.

Boston College, Community Analysis and Action Series (Five Monographs).

The Brookings Institution. Making Federalism Work. Washington, D.C., 1969.

Committee for Economic Development. Reshaping Government in Metropolitan Areas. New York, 1970.

Committee for Economic Development. Toward a New Housing Policy - The Legacy of the Sixties. New York, 1969.

The Council of State Governments. State Offices of Community Affairs: Their Functions, Organization and Enabling Legislation. Washington, D.C., 1969.

Government Affairs Foundation. State Constitutional Restrictions on Local Borrowing and Property Taxing Powers. Albany, New York, 1965.

Hadden, Jeffrey K. and Edgar F. Borgatta. American Cities; Their Social Characteristics. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.

Hammer, Greene, Siler Associates. Comprehensive Planning Assistance in the Small Community. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1969.

Holberg, Otto G., Exploring The Small Community. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1955.

Interdepartmental Planning Requirements Task Group. A Unified Planning Requirements System. Washington, D.C., 1969.

International City Management Association, Urban Data Service. Economics of Small Cities. Washington, D.C., 1969.

International City Management Association, The Municipal Year Book. Washington, D.C., 1969.

International City Management Association, Urban Data Service. Councils of Governments: Trends and Issues. Washington, D.C., 1969.

International City Management Association, Urban Data Service. Federal, State, Local Relationships. Washington, D.C., 1969.

International City Managers Association, The Municipal Year Book. Chicago, 1968.

International City Managers Association, The Municipal Year Book. Chicago, 1967.

Murphy, Raymond E., The American City: An Urban Geography. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

National Urban Coalition. Agenda for Positive Action: State Programs in Housing and Community Development.

North Dakota Economic Development Commission, North Dakota Community Betterment Program.

President's Committee on Urban Housing. A Decent Home. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1968.

President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty. The People Left Behind. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1967.

University of Florida, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Community Study Guide.

University of Georgia, Community Self Assistance Program, (Community Social Analysis). Series No. 5.

University of Wisconsin, Appraising Our Community Series.

Urban American Incorporated. The Ill Housed. Washington, D.C., 1969.

Warren, Roland L. Studying Your Community. New York: Free Press, 1965.